# 102 MONITOR

Environmental Protection Agency Washington D.C.

Volume 8, No. 2
APRIL 1978

## CEQ ISSUES MEMO TO HEADS OF AGENCIES ON IMPLEMENTATION OF E.O. 11988 and E.O. 11990

On March 21 the Council on Environmental Quality issued a memorandum concerning implementation of Executive Order 11988 on Floodplain Management and Executive Order 11990 on Protection of Wetlands. The memo addresses: the relationship between the two orders; agency procedures; the June progress report; and application of the orders. Turn to page 3.

## CEQ COUNCIL MEMBER SPETH ADDRESSES ENVIRONMENTAL INDUSTRY COUNCIL CONCERNING SOLAR ENERGY PROSPECTS

"The Sky is Falling: New Prospects for Solar Energy," a speech given by Gus Speth concerning solar energy's potential as a leading U.S. energy source, appears on pages 9 through 15.

## CEQ CHAIRMAN WARREN ADDRESSES SYMPOSIUM ON THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

In a speech before a symposium of the annual meeting of the Association for Advancement of Science, Charles Warren pointed to the "unnatural" impact of man's activities on species evolution. "We have artifically accelerated both the evolution of species ... as well as the death of species, befoer any natural successore assumes the ecological role that the extinct member played." The text of the speech is reprinted beginning of page 16.

*Contents: see inside cover*

CONTENTS


| | |
|---|---|
| E.O. 11988 and E.O. 11990 Memo | 3 |
| Prospects for Solar Energy | 9 |
| Threatened and Endangered Species | 16 |
| State Index of EISs Filed During February 1978 | 25 |
| Agency Index of EISs Filed During February 1978 | 30 |
| EISs Filed During February 1978 | 34 |
| Cumulative Summary | 77 |
| Subscription Information | 78 |

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
722 JACKSON PLACE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

March 21, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Implementation of Executive Order 11988 on Floodplain Management and Executive Order 11990 on Protection of Wetlands

President Carter issued two Executive orders last May requiring all executive agencies to take special care when undertaking actions that may affect wetlands or floodplains, directly or indirectly. The orders require agencies to avoid disrupting these areas wherever there is a practicable alternative, and to minimize any environmental harm that might be caused by federal actions. The President directed all agencies to provide national leadership by taking actions to encourage sound land use practices.

These orders were important components of the President's Message on the Environment last year. The President and the public are looking to each agency for timely and effective implementation. This memorandum addresses four matters relating to the implementation of the orders that have been brought to our attention by agency officials.

Relationship Between the Two Orders

Several agencies have inquired how to handle situations when both orders would apply, as, for example, in coastal areas, where most wetlands are located in floodplains. Although we do not believe this will be a practical problem, the basic rule is: both orders should be followed if an action overlaps floodplains and wetlands areas, but the floodplains order (which is more detailed) should control if there appears to be any conflict or question about how to carry out the orders. This policy will avoid potential confusion and duplication between the two Executive orders.

Agency Procedures

Both orders require agencies to have procedures for complying with their requirements. The floodplains order sets a deadline for agencies to "issue or amend existing regulations and procedures within one year," which will be May 24, 1978. The orders also encourage agencies to use existing decision-making processes where appropriate. Incorporating the orders' requirements into agency planning and decisionmaking procedures can ensure that wetland and floodplain values will be part of existing programs and will not cause unnecessary duplication or delay in government operations. Additional guidance concerning agency procedures is attached.

June Progress Report

Floodplains. Section 5 of the floodplains Executive order requires the head of each agency to submit a report to CEQ and WRC on June 30, 1978 on the status of agency procedures and the impact of the order on the agency's operations. The reports will be helpful in preparing our progress reports to President Carter on the implementation of his orders. They will also assist the WRC in its continuing review of agency practices and procedures, as directed by Section 5 of the order.

Wetlands. The Council requests at this time that you transmit a similar report on June 30 to us on your agency's experience with the wetlands order (we indicated last November that we would be requesting a first-year report on E.O. 11990).

The attachment to this memo provides further guidance on the content of the reports.

Application of the Orders

Several agencies have questioned whether the Executive orders apply to their activities. The orders explicitly state that they apply to specified actions of all executive agencies, including the military departments, as the term "executive agency" is used in Section 105 of Title 5 of the United States Code. The orders apply to those agency activities which directly or indirectly affect floodplains or wetlands.

If you have some impediment to complying with a particular requirement of the orders, please identify the problems in your June 30 report. You should indicate how your agency will meet the President's overall policy direction if particular procedural requirements cannot be followed in every case. Each agency will be expected to have a set of procedures which explains how the agency will comply with the orders. Other quasi-governmental organizations, such as certain joint commissions, are urged to adopt the orders' policies and procedures for their own operations as well.

Charles Warren

CHARLES WARREN
Chairman

Attachment

ATTACHMENT

This attachment provides further guidance on agency procedures and the June 30 progress report. We have tried to answer several inquiries the Council has received on the implementation of the orders.

1. Single set of procedures. Each department should have a single set of procedures which apply to all units. Major sub-departmental components (such as agencies, bureaus, and administrations) that have programs and activities which substantially affect wetlands or floodplains should also have their own procedures, which may be included or incorporated by reference in the departmental procedures.

2. Content. Agency procedures for implementing the orders should contain relevant materials explaining:

(a) policy directives, such as commitments to sound management, ranging from the design of agency programs and proposals through the monitoring and evaluation of agency activities;

(b) substantive requirements, such as standards for selecting alternatives and minimizing harm;

(c) mechanical requirements, such as timing, preparation, and circulation of documents and public notices; and

(d) other useful information, such as identifying officials in Washington and in the field who are responsible for the agency's compliance with the orders.

3. Form. Agency procedures are required to be issued in a form that an agency customarily uses to establish binding procedures which govern the conduct of agency staff, whether these are called rules, regulations, procedures, orders, or something else. Staff manuals and more specialized supplementary guidance may also be helpful. The Council places great importance on having these procedures written in plain, direct language. We would urge you to request your staff to edit the regulations again if you find them hard to read. Federal, state, and local officials, applicants for federal permits or aid, and members of the public should be able to understand and use these procedures without difficulty.

4. Deadline. Some agencies have expressed concern about meeting the May 24 deadline for floodplain procedures. To provide agencies with as much time as possible to prepare a specific and practical set of procedures, this requirement may be read to require final procedures to be published, rather than to be effective, by May 24. It would also be permissible for individual units which should have their own procedures to be covered by an adequate set of departmental regulations on a temporary basis, if the unit issues basic policy guidance to staff and publicly announces a schedule for producing its own procedures. These should be published in final form no later than November 1978.

5. Relationship to NEPA Regulations. Several agencies have inquired about delaying their procedures pending the issuance of our NEPA regulations. There is no basis for postponing action to comply with the floodplains and wetlands orders because we expect the basic environmental impact statement process to be retained in the regulations (assessment/early notices, draft, final, referral/decision). Agency procedures can be modified if necessary to accommodate any changes in the impact statement process.

6. WRC Guidelines. The U.S. Water Resources Council has recently issued guidance to assist agencies in preparing their regulations. The WRC's "Floodplain Management Guidelines for Implementing E.O. 11988" (Feb. 10, 1978) are an excellent basis for a general understanding of the order and for guidance on its implementation.

7. Consultation. As the WRC Guidelines note, agencies are required to consult with the WRC, Federal Insurance Administration (FIA) and CEQ before publishing their procedures or making them available for public review. WRC and FIA will be reviewing these procedures in detail. In accord with our oversight and coordination responsibilities, the Council will focus on mediating any major disagreements among agencies in an effort to implement the order promptly. Agencies should follow a similar approach in issuing or amending procedures under the wetlands order, and should consult with EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and CEQ.

8. Recommended Schedule. For those agencies which have not yet written their procedures for the floodplains order, we recommend that draft procedures be prepared and consultation begun before the end of this month. Federal Register publication initiating a 30-day public review period in April could be followed by a few weeks in May for staff revision and agency approval.

June 30 Progress Report

We will be looking for several items in your report. In addition to providing a list and a copy of all your agency's procedures and guidance for implementing the order, please indicate the schedule for preparing any further procedures or guidance, whether formal or informal.

The Council is especially concerned with the substantive influence of the order on agency decisions which affect floodplains and wetlands. Your reports should indicate, at a minimum:

1) the number of times you have made a finding that there was no practicable alternative to siting an action in a floodplain and/or in a wetland (broken down by major agency programs); and

2) an estimate of the number of acres directly affected by these decisions and, where known, the number of acres indirectly affected.

These figures should be readily obtainable from the public notices prepared by your staff under Section 2(a) of the order and from environmental impact statements and assessments. We would also be pleased to receive information on actions which have enhanced floodplains and wetlands.

# THE SKY IS FALLING:
# NEW PROSPECTS FOR SOLAR ENERGY

REMARKS BY GUS SPETH, COUNCIL MEMBER
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

BEFORE THE
ENVIRONMENTAL INDUSTRY COUNCIL

FEBRUARY 23, 1978
WASHINGTON, D.C.

THOUGH I HAVE NOT SEEN AN ADVANCE COPY OF THEIR REMARKS, I SUSPECT MY COLLEAGUES ON THIS PANEL WILL COVER THOROUGHLY THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF FOSSIL-FUEL DEVELOPMENT AND COMBUSTION. I RESERVE, OF COURSE, MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO NIT-PICK LATER ON . . . BUT I WANT TO DEVOTE MY TIME TO A SINGLE TOPIC THAT MAY OTHERWISE RECEIVE ONLY PASSING MENTION: THE PROSPECTS FOR SOLAR ENERGY.

THE PRINCIPAL SUPPLY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE UNITED STATES ARE COAL, NUCLEAR POWER, AND SOLAR, BOTH DIRECT AND INDIRECT. THE NATIONAL ENERGY PLAN RECOGNIZES THAT ALL OF THESE OPTIONS WILL BE USED IN THE YEARS AHEAD. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS, HOWEVER, HAVE INCREASED CONCERN WITH BOTH COAL AND NUCLEAR AS LONGER-TERM SUPPLY OPTIONS AND HAVE PROVIDED THE BASIS FOR FAR GREATER OPTIMISM REGARDING SOLAR. THE ARGUMENTS ARE SUFFICIENTLY COMPELLING THAT MANY THOUGHTFUL PERSONS NOW BELIEVE WE SHOULD ADOPT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL STRATEGIES AIMED AT SHIFTING AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE -- PERHAPS WITHIN A FEW DECADES -- TO A SOCIETY BASED PREDOMINANTLY ON SOLAR ENERGY.

FIRST, LET'S CONSIDER SOME OF THE BENEFITS OF POWER FROM THE SUN. WHILE NOT COMPLETELY FREE OF ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS, SOLAR TECHNOLOGIES SHOULD GENERALLY HAVE A MUCH SMALLER IMPACT THAN CONVENTIONAL TECHNOLOGIES THAT PROVIDE EQUIVALENT AMOUNTS OF ENERGY. SOLAR POSES LITTLE RISK TO CLIMATE, AND CREATES LITTLE DIRECT AIR POLLUTION, NO RADIATION HAZARDS, AND NO RISK OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION.

IT OFFERS IMPORTANT ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES: THE U.S. IS THE ACKNOWLEDGED LEADER IN SOLAR TECHNOLOGY, AND CAN DEVELOP AN IMPORTANT EXPORT MARKET HERE IF WE GET CRACKING ON IT. FURTHER, SOLAR COULD MAKE A SUBSTANTIAL DENT IN OUR NAGGING UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM: PRELIMINARY DATA TO BE PUBLISHED THIS SUMMER INDICATE THAT CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN SOLAR HEATING SYSTEMS WILL GENERATE BETWEEN 2 TO 5 TIMES AS MANY JOBS AS THE SAME EXPENDITURE FOR CENTRAL STATION ELECTRIC POWER PLANTS.

SOLAR DIFFERS FROM OTHER ENERGY SOURCES IN ITS UTTER DEMOCRACY: IT FALLETH ON THE JUST AND THE UNJUST ALIKE, ON ARAB AND NON-ARAB. HENCE IT IS NOT SUBJECT TO EMBARGOES. ITS POTENTIAL IS IMMENSE: A RECENT STUDY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONCLUDES THAT FROM THE SINGLE STANDPOINT OF RESOURCE AVAILABILITY, IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO OPERATE AN ADVANCED, POST-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY IN CALIFORNIA ALMOST ENTIRELY ON SOLAR ENERGY, EVEN WITH MAJOR INCREASES IN POPULATION AND PER CAPITA INCOME. SOLAR ENERGY THUS HAS THE POTENTIAL TO BE A LEADING SOURCE OF U.S. ENERGY SUPPLY, NOT JUST A SUPPLEMENT. INDEED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF TECHNOLOGY AND RESOURCES, THERE APPEARS TO BE NO REASON WHY SOLAR ENERGY CANNOT EVENTUALLY MEET MOST OF OUR NEEDS, GIVEN ADEQUATE EFFORTS TO INCREASE ENERGY EFFICIENCY. WHETHER AND HOW SOON SOLAR ENERGY IN FACT BECOMES THE MAINSTAY OF U.S. SUPPLY DEPENDS PRINCIPALLY ON ECONOMIC FACTORS.

HAPPILY, THE ECONOMICS OF SOLAR ENERGY ARE IMPROVING WITH REMARKABLE SPEED. IN JUST THE LAST FIVE YEARS, SOLAR ENERGY HAS ADVANCED FROM ITS FORMER STATUS AS A TECHNICAL CURIOSITY TO BECOME THE SUBJECT OF SERIOUS DEVELOPMENT. AMONG THE COMPANIES INTERESTED IN SOLAR ARE DOW CORNING, GRUMMAN AVIATION, MOBIL AND SHELL OIL, TEXAS INSTRUMENTS, RCA, AND MOTOROLA. OUT OF CURIOSITY, I CHECKED THE WASHINGTON, D.C. YELLOW PAGES YESTERDAY FOR LISTINGS UNDER SOLAR ENERGY. THE MAY, 1975 EDITION HAD ONE SUCH LISTING; THE MAY, 1977 EDITION HAD SEVENTEEN. ACCORDING TO SCIENCE MAGAZINE, THE NUMBER OF SOLAR-HEATED HOUSES BUILT IN THE U.S. HAS DOUBLED EVERY EIGHT MONTHS SINCE 1973.

DESPITE THESE EVIDENCES OF INTEREST, MANY OF THE COMMENTS I SEE -- FROM OFFICIALS IN GOVERNMENT AS WELL AS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY -- ASSURE US THAT THE SOLAR ERA IS OFF IN THE DISTANT FUTURE, IF IT EXISTS AT ALL. I THINK -- AND I HOPE MY REMARKS WILL SUPPORT THIS VIEW -- THAT SOLAR ENERGY CAN CONTRIBUTE IN A MAJOR WAY IN THIS CENTURY TO MEETING OUR ENERGY NEEDS. CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING:

-- SOLAR COLLECTORS CAN NOW PRODUCE HOT WATER AT COSTS GENERALLY COMPETITIVE WITH ELECTRIC WATER HEATERS, AND THE USE OF SOLAR FOR HEATING HOMES AND BUILDINGS, PRODUCING INDUSTRIAL STEAM AND POWERING HEAT ENGINES SHOULD BEGIN TO BECOME COMPETITIVE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS.

-- PHOTOVOLTAICS (OR "SOLAR") CELLS, WHICH PRODUCE ELECTRICITY DIRECTLY FROM SUNLIGHT AND HAVE POWERED SATELLITES, WERE ROUGHLY 100 TIMES MORE EXPENSIVE A FEW YEARS AGO THAN THEY ARE TODAY. A NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS ARE ALREADY ECONOMIC; BY 1985 SOLAR CELLS ARE EXPECTED TO BE ECONOMICALLY COMPETITIVE FOR A WIDE RANGE OF APPLICATIONS. IF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S PRICE GOALS ARE MET AS EXPECTED, MARKET FORECASTS SUGGEST THAT PHOTOVOLTAICS COULD BECOME A MAJOR SOURCE OF NEW ELECTRICAL GENERATING CAPACITY IN THE 1990's.

-- BIOMASS--WHICH INCLUDES FOREST, CROP AND ANIMAL RESIDUES, AS WELL AS CROPS GROWN FOR THEIR ENERGY CONTENT -- HAS AN ENERGY CONTENT COMPARABLE TO WESTERN LIGNITE AND CAN BE BURNED DIRECTLY OR CONVERTED TO A FULL RANGE OF STORABLE LIQUID OR GASEOUS FUELS, SUCH AS METHANE AND ALCOHOL. ONE RECENT STUDY SUGGESTS THAT SUCH SOURCES COULD PROVIDE AN ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF ABOUT 1 MILLION BARRELS OF OIL PER DAY BY THE YEAR 2000. MORE IMPORTANT IS THE GROWING AGREEMENT THAT, WITH APPROPRIATE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT, FUELS FROM BIOMASS CAN BE ECONOMICAL ON A LARGE SCALE BY THE CENTURY'S END.

-- SMALL-SCALE WIND ENERGY SYSTEMS ARE ALREADY A PRACTICAL REALITY. WHILE SOME SYSTEMS ARE COST-EFFECTIVE FOR SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS TODAY, PROJECTIONS FOR THE COST OF ELECTRICITY GENERATED FROM WIND POWER RANGE FROM 5¢ KWH FOR SMALL (8KW) MACHINES, TO 1.7¢ FOR LARGE (1500 KW)

MACHINES. RECENT STUDIES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SUGGEST THAT WIND ENERGY COULD PROVIDE ON THE ORDER OF 10 PERCENT OF THE NATION'S ELECTRICAL ENERGY DEMAND BY THE YEAR 2000.

-- SMALL-SCALE HYDRO SYSTEMS ARE RECEIVING INCREASED ATTENTION. STUDIES INDICATE THAT MORE THAN 14,000 MEGAWATTS ELECTRIC (MWE) OF UNTAPPED HYDRO POWER POTENTIAL EXISTS AT SMALL, 3 TO 5 MWE SITES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES. IN NEW ENGLAND, FOR EXAMPLE, MORE THAN 100 HYDRO SITES HAVE BEEN ABANDONED SINCE 1941 BECAUSE OTHER SOURCES OF POWER BECOME MORE ECONOMIC; MANY HAVE NOW REGAINED ECONOMIC VIABILITY. AN ADDITIONAL 14,000 MWE IS AVAILABLE IN UNFILLED GENERATION BAYS AT EXISTING DAM SITES.

THUS SOLAR ENERGY IS NOT A FAR-OUT OPTION; IT IS WITH US TODAY IN VARIOUS FORMS, AND THE OBSTACLES TO ITS WIDESPREAD APPLICATION ARE FALLING RAPIDLY. THE OUTLOOK FOR SOLAR IS PROMISING ENOUGH THAT, IF WE INVEST SUFFICIENT DETERMINATION AND RESOURCES NOW, WE COULD FIND SOLAR OUR PRIMARY REPLACEMENT SOURCE OF ENERGY A DECADE HENCE.

A STRONG CASE CAN BE MADE THAT A NATIONAL COMMITMENT IN THE 1950'S TO DEVELOP SOLAR TECHNOLOGY -- ONE COMPARABLE TO THE COMMITMENT WE MADE THEN TO NUCLEAR POWER -- WOULD HAVE LED TO THE WIDESPREAD ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF SOLAR ENERGY TODAY.

WHATEVER THE WORTH OF THAT SPECULATION, IT'S CRITICAL THAT WE RECOGNIZE THAT A MAJOR NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO SOLAR IS NO LONGER MERELY DESIRABLE; IT IS ESSENTIAL. GIVEN THE LONG LEAD-TIMES NECESSARY TO CONVERT OUR ENERGY SUPPLY SYSTEMS, WE SHOULD MAKE THAT COMMITMENT NOW.

REMARKS BY CHARLES WARREN, CHAIRMAN
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SYMPOSIUM ON THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION
ANNUAL MEETING, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE
SHERATON PARK HOTEL

February 17, 1978

# A DOG IN THE NIGHT-TIME:

## Endangered Species and the Economics of Silence

The redoubtable English scientist Sherlock Holmes was once asked to investigate the disappearance of a famous race horse and the murder of its trainer. That particular case, recounted by Dr. Watson under the title "Silver Blaze," had several puzzling aspects. Among them was this: because Silver Blaze was the favorite in a high-stakes race to be held a few days after its disappearance, the horse was closely guarded -- by stable boys who took turns watching it around the clock, as well as by a watch-dog. Yet neither of these measures had sufficed to prevent the theft of the horse.

In many of his previous cases, Holmes had been constantly patronized by one Inspector Lestrade, a member of the public police force. In this case, however, Holmes encountered an Inspector Gregory -- a man who, instead of deprecating Holmes' methods, paid them great respect. After Holmes had made his first examination of the scene of the crime, Inspector Gregory asked Holmes for advice.

"Is there any point," he inquired, "to which you would wish to draw my attention?"

And Holmes, because Gregory was so obviously sincere, answered: "To the curious incident of the dog in the night-time."

"The dog did nothing in the night-time."

"That," replied Sherlock Holmes, "was the curious incident."

This exchange recurred to me as I brooded on the topic assigned to me this afternoon: NEPA and the Economics of Endangered Species. For I think that, in trying to weigh the value of endangered species, we are dealing not only with what science tells us, but also with what it does <u>not</u> tell. We are not entirely weighing evidence, but also the

lack of evidence. As Sherlock Holmes indicates, however, silence has its own eloquence, and we must try to interpret it. We must listen carefully to creatures that do nothing in the night-time.

Today, I would like to review briefly the arguments advanced on behalf of making strenuous efforts to preserve species threatened with extinction. Mainly, I shall be singing a song well known to most of you....but perhaps I can chime in with a few new notes.

There is, in NEPA, a striking phrase that seems to me especially germane to any discussion of the economics of endangered species. The Act requires agencies to give "appropriate consideration" in their decisionmaking, along with economic and technical considerations, to "presently unquantified environmental amenities and values."

Here, very often, is the heart of the difficulty in environmental protection. How does one go about quantifying a host of environmental amenities and values, ranging from visibility in the National Parks, to a risk of cancer in food additives that cannot be calculated with any precision, to the continued existence of a three-inch fish? Economists claim to be able to appraise the worth of such activities as recreational fishing or bird-watching with considerable accuracy. In economic terms, for example, bird-watching is "worth" what the enthusiast spends for binoculars, perhaps boots to stomp around in, and the gasoline he buys to get to the marsh.

Such analyses are suggestive, perhaps, but I do not find them convincing. The fact that a bird-watcher spends $75 for a pair of binoculars does not mean that his hobby is "worth" that amount to him; if the binoculars cost $150 instead, and gasoline cost a dollar a gallon instead of 65 cents, he might still pay the price.

Moreover, it is remarkable how strongly many people feel about activities that impinge upon wildlife with which they have no direct connection. The annual killing of harp seal pups in Canada, I understand, brings a phenomenal number of protests to Congress . . .the vast majority, one must presume, from people who have never seen a harp seal. One cannot quantify such a "demand" except in political terms.

The basic difficulty, perhaps, may lie in the extraordinary dominance that economics has come to exercise

over our thinking. The late E.F. Schumacher, himself a Rhodes Scholar in economics, pointed out in his book, Small is Beautiful, that there was considerable disagreement about the establishment of the first faculty chair in economics at Oxford in the early 1800's. The Provost of Oriel College of Oxford was reluctant to admit into the curriculum a science "so prone to usurp the rest." Even the man who endowed that first chair, according to Schumacher, "felt it necessary to make it clear that he expected the University to keep the new study 'in its proper place'." Schumacher also quotes from Professor E. H. Phelps Brown, who, in his Presidential Address to the Royal Economic Society, talked about the "the smallness of the contribution that the most conspicuous developments of economics in the last quarter of a century have made to the solution of the most pressing problems of the times"; included among the "most pressing problems" he listed was "checking the adverse effects on the environment and the quality of life" from industrialism, population growth, and urbanism.

Lest all these comments be dismissed as the carping of academics who have never met a payroll, let me quote, finally, from the January 16 issue of Business Week, which had this to say about the annual meeting of the American Economics Association: "The sessions of the AEA boringly demonstrated to anyone who could flog himself into listening that the economics profession faces intellectual bankruptcy."

For what it's worth, my own undergraduate degree is in economics, and I have no interest in undermining my baccalaureate; I may have to update my resume some day. But one need not buy all of Schumacher's ideas on such esoteric subjects as Buddhist economics to feel that economics plays a disproprotionate part in our decisions . . .similar, in our own day, to the role of theology in the Middle Ages: angels dancing on the head of a pin have given way to $M_1$, $M_2$, and the latest erudite dissection of the reasons why last year's economic forecast was wrong.

For all its faults, economics probably remains the best tool we have today for balancing dissimilar things . . .for comparing apples to oranges, migrating caribou to an oil pipeline, or a dam to the Snail Darter. Those of us concerned about endangered species, as well as about other national needs, must try to make this imperfect scale work for us as well as we can.

And we have some limited but provocative arguments to make, arguments that can occasionally be translated into economic terms. One of them has to do with the sharp increase in the rate of species extinction. Fossil evidence indicates that, in prehuman times, mammal and bird species became extinct at the rate of three per century. Since the settlement of this country began, the extinction rate has jumped to 150 species each century. Last year's CEQ annual report, leaning heavily on data supplied us by other government agencies and private organizations, states that 85 species or subspecies of vertebrate animals are known to have been extinguished since 1900. In the continental United States, according to the Smithsonian, 9.9 percent of our native higher plants are endangered or threatened; for Hawaii, the figure is much higher; 38 percent of the Islands' native species are endangered or threatened, and another 12 percent are already extinct. Among Hawaiian birds, the figures are even worse: over a third are endangered, and another third extinct.

These figures take on economic meaning when we consider the present value of other species to man, and realize how little of the potential of other species has been adequately investigated. Ninety percent of the food humans eat comes from just 12 crops. As many as half of all the prescriptions filled in the United States each year contain a drug of natural origin. Even biological nuisances have proved to be useful to us on occasion: the classic example is bread mold, high on the list of anybody's unwanted species 50 years ago, from which Sir Alexander Fleming synthesized penicillin. More recently, another fungus was isolated as the cause of death of cows in Wisconsin; lodged in the intestine of cows, it prevented blood-clotting, so that minor punctures caused by ingestion of hay could not heal themselves. Once the chemical agent was isolated, it was transferred -- in the form of a pesticide -- from farm to city, where it performed the same lethal function on rats. And, for a while at least, that chemical was used in human therapy on people whose blood had too <u>much</u> tendency to clot.

The animal world also offers us examples of useful services, other than food or labor, provided to man by other species. Insulin is derived from the pancreas of livestock; it can be synthesized, but doing so is expensive. At present, the only animal accepted by the Food

and Drug Administration for the safety-testing of hepatitis vaccine is the chimpanzee, whose survival in West Africa is in doubt. To give another example, early this week, NBC carried a report on the successful use of bee venom in treating the symptoms of arthritis.

Other species can also alert man to environmental trouble. Creatures ranging from the bald eagle to humble algae are highly sensitive to pollution. Such pollution, of course, can be monitored -- often with greater scientific precision -- by man-made instruments of various kinds. However, you have to know where to look for such pollution, and what kind of pollution to look for, before you can measure it. It was a decline in tree growth in Scandinavia, for instance, that alerted us to the atmospheric transport of "acid rains" to countries far from the sulfur dioxide emissions that caused them.

Each of these examples has been cited before, and they add up, item by item, to a useful argument. The really important addition to that argument, I believe, is this: only about 15 percent of the plant and animal species on earth have even been identified in scientific literature, let alone closely studied. Only about 5 percent of the world's plant species have yet been screened for pharmacologically active ingredients. In permitting the accelerated destruction of species by man, therefore, we are throwing away unique genetic entities before we have any idea of their possible value to man. Moreover, unlike many human errors that can be corrected after their unwanted consequences manifest themselves, an extinct species is gone forever; we cannot dig in our biological graveyard and reconstitute a creature that might have been helpful to us.

At bottom, however, this is an argument from analogy and from scientific ignorance, not from scientific certitude. Eventually we have to confess that we do not know what possible use the vast majority of species is to man. It is possible that some species might, despite exhaustive study, prove of no value to man?

I am forced to concede that it is possible. As the relatively new science of ecology matures in sophistication; as it grow with experience; and as it catches up with other disciplines in the amount of interest and financial support accorded it, we can expect it to reveal more and more of the astonishingly subtle relationships

that link us to other species. Certainly it has done so in the past.

Yet we must be careful, it seems to me, not to push our ecological arguments too far. Species extinction is a natural phenomenon, and the extinction of some species in the past was necessary to man's evolution; our primitive forebears would have done poorly in competition with the dinosaurs and sabre-tooth tigers. In the past, however, species extinction occurred over very long geologic periods of time even those species that did disappear contributed to the evolution of both the competitive and non-competitive forms that succeeded them. Thus extinct species in earlier eras were, from the evolutionary standpoint, as much partners of newer forms as their enemies.

Today, by contrast, the unnatural impact of man's activities leaves us with the biological loss, but none of the biological gain. We have artificially accelerated both the evolution of species -- pesticide-resistant insects, for example, which produce new generations much more rapidly than we can produce new chemicals -- as well as the death of species, before any natural successor assumes the ecological role that the extinct member played. We risk creating monsters that respond not to the ancient thrust and parry of natural stimuli, but to the synthetic forces of alien compounds and man-made structures.

These things are true. Even so, we must not degrade science by exaggerating its proper claims in order to refute the criticism of those who say that our concern for other species is inflated, that it is "impeding progress." The remedy for an overweening economics is not an overly speculative science. By joining our detractors in their arguments from guesswork, we risk compromising the integrity that science must retain if it is to be accepted as a reliable, though limited, guide for our actions.

Each species occupies some niche in its ecological system, or it would not exist. But pushing the ecological argument to its extreme is particularly vulnerable in the case of endangered species. By the time a species is as reduced in population as the California Condor or the Snail Darter, it is doubtful that its ecological function is important to anything except itself -- and, perhaps, to an ecosystem already on the verge of extinction. If we know that such creatures have an untapped economic value -- as

a source of medicine, for example -- fine, let us assert it.

But if we do not know it, let us not fear to admit that, too. Conjecturing that some relic species might give us the cure for cancer is little better, as an argument, than speculating about the existence of supermarkets on Pluto. They may exist, but if we build arguments on such shaky foundations in the name of ecological science, where will we be if future events prove our structure to be a house of cards? What if a species disappears. . .and nothing happens?

As Aldo Leopold pointed out in Sand County Almanac, in the earlier decades of this century, ornithologists warned us that reductions in bird populations might lead to an onslaught of insects. When the predicted upsurge in insect populations failed to materialize, the ornithologists were left with figurative, supposedly "scientific" egg on their faces. In China, by contrast, such an epidemic of crop-destroying insects was reported after a campaign to kill seed-destroying birds. The difference, evidently, was in the ecological dynamics of the two situations; until we understand those dynamics thoroughly, we should not risk the credibility of environmental science with iffy assertions of disaster.

But please understand me on this point: I am not suggesting that our concern for endangered and threatened species is misplaced; only that some of our arguments are.

Most to the point, we do not really have to reach into left field to defend our current actions on endangered species. There are enough species of known value to man to support our argument for the potential value of others, and the current rate of species depletion is so totally without precedent in the history of evolution as to evoke concern in any thoughtful, scientifically aware person.

Nor do we have to engage in ecological star-gazing to defend the Endangered Species Act against charges of extremism; the Fish and Wildlife Service has conducted more than 4500 "consultations" -- ranging from phone-calls to rather elaborate findings of fact -- on conflicts involving endangered species. So far, only three of those disputes could not be resolved in administrative consultation and went to court. Of the three court cases, only one -- the Snail Darter and TEllico -- has gone to the Supreme Court for ultimate disposition. One court case arising from each 1500 possible conflicts is an excellent record of legislative soundness -- a record, I suspect, far better than that of the Bill of Rights. To date, the Endangered Species Act has probably given us less trouble in the last four years than the Constitution of the United States.

And ultimately, we may be advancing arguments that are myopic in applying an extremely limited human economics to an incredibly rich and diverse natural budget of biological income and outgo. As Dr. David W. Ehrenfeld pointed out in an excellent, quietly skeptical article titled "The Conservation of Non-Resources," all the values I have discussed today are "anthropocentric values"; they all center on man, and assume that other species have no value unless their benefit to man can be demonstrated.

But a non-economic value of communities and species, he writes, is the simplest of all to assert: "(T)hey should be conserved because they exist and have existed for a long time. Long-standing existence in nature is deemed to carry with it the unimpeachable right to continued existence. Existence is the only criterion of value, and diminution of the number of existing things is the best measure of decrease of value. This is an ancient way of evaluating 'conservability'."

And by way of explaining this "ancient" method for deciding which species are worth saving and which not, Ehrenfeld quotes from the first endangered species act: "Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of everything that creepeth upon the earth, there went in two and two unto Noah in the ark, the male and the female, as God had commanded Noah."

Such an argument, rooted ultimately in a value-system that respects all life precisely because it is life, will not take root in our society soon, if ever. It will convince only those who are already disposed to accept it.

Fair enough; let those of us who are so inclined, do so. We have enough practical, sound arguments to defend our views without resorting to exaggeration. We have enough experience to believe that activities important to our national interest can proceed without endangering species. And, if we are imaginative enough, we can realize that even the lack of evidence is sometimes helpful.

As Sherlock Holmes guessed, the fact that the dog did nothing in the night-time did not necessarily mean that nothing happened; it could also mean that something quite significant had happened, but seemed routine at the time. The thief who stole Silver Blaze did not draw a bark from the dog because he was well known to the dog. That deduction led to the successful conclusion of the case, and to another satisfying entry in Dr. Watson's memoirs.

Similarly, the lack of ecological disasters does not mean that nothing important is happening to our globe. We should listen carefully to the mute testimony of species that are being snuffed out in this biological night-time man has created. They cannot speak for themselves. . . but the sound of their silence should fall on our ears as a most eloquent alarm.

-0-

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

03-16-78

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

| STATE | COUNTY | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | ORIG AGENCY NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DRAFT | Antarctic Living Marine Resources | 80097 | 02-01-78 | STAT |
| | | DRAFT | Tanker Safety and Pollution Prevention | 80099 | 02-03-78 | DOT |
| | | DRAFT | Chicago-Midway Low Fare Route Proceeding | 80154 | 02-15-78 | CAB |
| | | DRAFT | National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Lead | 80174 | 02-22-78 | EPA |
| | | FINAL | DBCP Occupational Exposure Standard | 80179 | 02-23-78 | DLAB |
| Alabama | Calhoun | DRAFT | Relocation of US 278, Gadsden to Piedmont | 80197 | 02-28-78 | DOT |
| | Etowah | DRAFT | Relocation of US 278, Gadsden to Piedmont | 80197 | 02-28-78 | DOT |
| | Jefferson | DRAFT | I-65-3(52)(53) and M-7257(1), Lewisburg to Warrior | 80113 | 02-06-78 | DOT |
| Alaska | | FINAL | Beluga Sts. # 7,8,9-Bernice Lake Unit 3 | 80147 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| California | several | DRAFT | Mendocino National Forest, Timber Management Plan | 80142 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| | Contra Costa | DRAFT | Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks | 80152 | 02-13-78 | COE |
| | Lake | DRAFT | Cache Creek Basin, Clear Lake | 80195 | 02-28-78 | COE |
| | Los Angeles | DRAFT | Mar Vista Street, Whittier Blvd. to College Ave. | 80144 | 02-13-78 | DOT |
| | | DRAFT | Route 91 Freeway and Harbor Freeway Interchange | 80188 | 02-27-78 | DOT |
| | | FINAL | San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F. | 80169 | 02-21-78 | USDA |
| | San Bernardino | FINAL | San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F. | 80169 | 02-21-78 | USDA |
| | San Francisco | DRAFT | Yerba Buena Center, Urban Renewal Plan | 80158 | 02-16-78 | HUD |
| | San Mateo | DRAFT | Pillar Point Marina, Regulatory Permit | 80172 | 02-21-78 | COE |
| | Santa Barbara | FINAL | Space Shuttle Program, Vandenberg AFB | 80114 | 02-07-78 | USAF |
| | Yolo | DRAFT | Cache Creek Basin, Clear Lake | 80195 | 02-28-78 | COE |
| Colorado | several | FINAL | Proposed Foothills Project | 80156 | 02-16-78 | DOI |
| | Adams | DRAFT | Noise Exposure, Stapleton and Buckley Airports | 80143 | 02-13-78 | HUD |
| | Arapahoe | DRAFT | Noise Exposure, Stapleton and Buckley Airports | 80143 | 02-13-78 | HUD |
| | Eagle | FINAL | Eagle Aspen Unit Plan, White River N.F. | 80177 | 02-22-78 | USDA |
| | Fremont | FINAL | Canon Watershed Project | 80170 | 02-21-78 | USDA |
| | Mesa | DRAFT | Project S 7500 (8), Horizon Drive | 80112 | 02-06-78 | DOT |
| | Pitkin | FINAL | Eagle Aspen Unit Plan, White River N.F. | 80177 | 02-22-78 | USDA |
| District of Columbia | | DRAFT | Southeast Federal Center | 80100 | 02-03-78 | GSA |
| Florida | Columbia | DRAFT | Hospital Loop Road, Lake City | 80161 | 02-17-78 | DOT |
| | Hendry | DRAFT | Flood Control, Central and Southern Florida | 80162 | 02-17-78 | COE |
| | Pinellas | DRAFT | Bay Pines, VA Center, Improvements | 80185 | 02-24-78 | VA |

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

| STATE | COUNTY | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | ORIG AGENCY NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Georgia | DeKalb | FINAL | Brookwood Sta. Area Improvements, I-85, I-75 | 80118 | 02-07-78 | DOT |
| | | FINAL | I-85, Fulton-DeKalb Co. to I-285 | 80119 | 02-07-78 | DOT |
| | Fulton | DRAFT | Blair Village Apartment Complex, Proposed Sale | 80191 | 02-27-78 | HUD |
| | | FINAL | Brookwood Sta. Area Improvements, I-85, I-75 | 80118 | 02-07-78 | DOT |
| Hawaii | | DRAFT | Keaau-Pahoa Road, Pahoa Bypass, Project RS-0130(17 | 80110 | 02-06-78 | DOT |
| Idaho | | DRAFT | Kootenai N.F., Keeler Planning Unit | 80115 | 02-07-78 | USDA |
| | Idaho | DRAFT | Hot Point Land Management Plan, Nezperce NF | 80181 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| | Jerome | SUPPLE | Jerome Wastewater Facilities Project (S-1) | 80108 | 02-06-78 | EPA |
| Illinois | Ogle | DRAFT | US 51, 5th Avenue to Lakeview Drive, Rochelle | 80194 | 02-27-78 | DOT |
| Indiana | Allen | DRAFT | Fort Wayne Bypass, Project No. F-170-2(1) | 80120 | 02-07-78 | DOT |
| | | DRAFT | Baer Field, Fort Wayne Municipal Airport | 80166 | 02-17-78 | DOT |
| Iowa | Linn | DRAFT | Cedar Rapids Municipal Airport Runway Construction | 80155 | 02-15-78 | DOT |
| | Marshall | DRAFT | Iowa 14, Project No. F-14-5 | 80135 | 02-09-78 | DOT |
| | Scott | FINAL | Davenport Local Flood Protection | 80167 | 02-21-78 | COE |
| | Woodbury | DRAFT | Northeast Inner Loop, Sioux City Bypass | 80176 | 02-22-78 | DOT |
| Kansas | Sedgwick | FINAL | US 54 Improvement, Wichita | 80185 | 02-13-78 | DOT |
| | Wyandotte | SUPPLE | K-7 at Bonner Springs (S-3) | 80193 | 02-27-78 | DOT |
| Kentucky | Anderson | DRAFT | Taylorsville Lake Project | 80192 | 02-27-78 | COE |
| | Nelson | DRAFT | Taylorsville Lake Project | 80192 | 02-27-78 | COE |
| | Spencer | DRAFT | Taylorsville Lake Project | 80192 | 02-27-78 | COE |
| | Trimble | DRAFT | Trimble County Generating Station, Permit | 80127 | 02-08-78 | EPA |
| Louisiana | East Carroll | DRAFT | Walnut Roundway Watershed | 80186 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| | Madison | DRAFT | Walnut Roundway Watershed | 80186 | 02-13-78 | USDA |

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

03-16-78

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

| STATE | COUNTY | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | ORIG AGENCY NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maryland | Dorchester | DRAFT | US 50 Study Improvements, Vienna | 80190 | 02-27-78 | DOT |
| Massachusetts | | FINAL | MA-25 and MA-28, Wareham, Plymouth, and Bourne | 80126 | 02-07-78 | DOT |
| Michigan | Menominee | DRAFT | Menominee County Airport, Runway Construction | 80117 | 02-07-78 | DOT |
| | Newaygo | DRAFT | Corridor Alignment, Improvements of MI-37/MI-82 Br | 80129 | 02-08-78 | DOT |
| | Van Buren | SUPPLE | Palisades Nuclear Generating Plant (S-2) | 80121 | 02-07-78 | NRC |
| Mississippi | Chariton | DRAFT | Thomas Hill Unit 3, Mine Expansion, Transmission | 80180 | 02-23-78 | USDA |
| | Randolph | DRAFT | Thomas Hill Unit 3, Mine Expansion, Transmission | 80180 | 02-23-78 | USDA |
| Montana | | DRAFT | Kootenai N.F., Keeler Planning Unit | 80115 | 02-07-78 | USDA |
| | | FINAL | Missouri R., Nat'l Wild & Scenic Rivers System | 80183 | 02-23-78 | DOI |
| | several | FINAL | Beaverhead & Deerlodge N.F. Land Use Plan | 80163 | 02-17-78 | USDA |
| | Great Falls | SUPPLE | Sun River Flood Protection Project | 80106 | 02-03-78 | COE |
| Nebraska | Douglas | FINAL | Lonergan Lake Disposition | 80111 | 02-06-78 | HUD |
| | Scotts Bluff | DRAFT | Proposed Expansion of Existing WWT Facilities | 80151 | 02-14-78 | EPA |
| New York | | SUPPLE | I-90 to Bemus Point, 4(f) Lake Chautauqua | 80173 | 02-21-78 | DOT |
| | Broome | FINAL | Deposit Watershed, New York | 80105 | 02-03-78 | USDA |
| | Chenango | FINAL | Deposit Watershed, New York | 80105 | 02-03-78 | USDA |
| | Delaware | FINAL | Deposit Watershed, New York | 80105 | 02-03-78 | USDA |
| | Onondaga | DRAFT | Redevelopment Site of Hotel Syracuse | 80128 | 02-08-78 | HUD |
| | Orange | FINAL | N.Y. Animal Import Center, Stewart Airport | 80134 | 02-09-78 | USDA |
| | Suffolk | DRAFT | Proton-Proton Storage Accelerator Facility | 80149 | 02-14-78 | ERDA |
| North Carolina | Carteret | DRAFT | State Route 1201 at Salter Path | 80150 | 02-14-78 | DOT |
| | McDowell | DRAFT | US 221, Marion Bypass | 80138 | 02-10-78 | DOT |
| | Watauga | DRAFT | Permit, US 321, Middle Fork Creek | 80137 | 02-03-78 | DOT |
| | | SUPPLE | I-77 and US 74 Connector, Charlotte | 80123 | 02-07-78 | DOT |
| North Dakota | | SUPPLE | Garrison Diversion Plan | 80098 | 02-02-78 | DOI |
| | | SUPPLE | Antelope Valley Station, Two 455 MW Units | 80124 | 02-08-78 | USDA |
| | Morton | DRAFT | 3rd Street, Southeast Mandan, Improvement | 80139 | 02-13-78 | DOT |

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

03-16-78

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

| STATE | COUNTY | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | ORIG AGENCY NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ohio | Cuyahoga | FINAL | Big Creek Flood Protection Project | 80131 | 02-08-78 | COE |
| | Franklin | DRAFT | Metropolitan Area WWT Facilities, Columbus | 80165 | 02-17-78 | EPA |
| | | FINAL | Riverside Green & Riverside Hills Subdivisions | 80181 | 02-23-78 | HUD |
| Oregon | | DRAFT | Fremont NF Timber Management Plan, Lakeview | 80133 | 02-09-78 | USDA |
| | Hood | FINAL | Badger-Jordon Unit Plan, Hood N.F. | 80109 | 02-06-78 | USDA |
| | Morrow | FINAL | Boardman Coal Plant | 80148 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| | Multnomah | DRAFT | Basin Ave. and Going Str. Interchange, Greeley Ave | 80187 | 02-27-78 | DOT |
| | Wasco | FINAL | Badger-Jordon Unit Plan, Hood N.F. | 80109 | 02-06-78 | USDA |
| Pennsylvania | | SUPPLE | I-90 to Beaus Point, W(f) Lake Chautagua | 80173 | 02-21-78 | DOT |
| South Carolina | Berkeley | DRAFT | College Park Estates Subdivision | 80198 | 02-28-78 | HUD |
| Tennessee | Shelby | DRAFT | Hillshire Subdivision | 80153 | 02-15-78 | HUD |
| Texas | Austin | SUPPLE | Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station Unit No. 1 | 80184 | 02-24-78 | NRC |
| | Brazoria | DRAFT | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Chocolate Bayou | 80182 | 02-23-78 | COE |
| | Fort Bend | DRAFT | Cornerstones Subdivision | 80125 | 02-07-78 | HUD |
| | | FINAL | Willowridge Subdivision | 80168 | 02-21-78 | HUD |
| | Galveston | DRAFT | Meadow Bend Subdivision, League City | 80132 | 02-08-78 | HUD |
| | Harris | DRAFT | Tallow Wood Subdivision | 80102 | 02-03-78 | HUD |
| | | DRAFT | Highland Creek Village Subdivision | 80103 | 02-03-78 | HUD |
| | | DRAFT | Cornerstones Subdivision | 80125 | 02-07-78 | HUD |
| | | DRAFT | Park Meadows Subdivision, Deer Park | 80157 | 02-16-78 | HUD |
| | | DRAFT | Colony Creek Village, Subdivision | 80189 | 02-27-78 | HUD |
| | | FINAL | Willowridge Subdivision | 80168 | 02-21-78 | HUD |
| | | FINAL | Charterwood Subdivision | 80175 | 02-23-78 | HUD |
| | | FINAL | Greengate Place and Birnam Wood | 80178 | 02-23-78 | HUD |
| | | FINAL | Autumn Run and Bear Creek Subdivisions | 80196 | 02-28-78 | HUD |
| | Kaufman | SUPPLE | Channel/Levee Improvement, East Fork Trinity River | 80164 | 02-17-78 | COE |
| | Tarrant | DRAFT | Foster Village, Windcrest Park and Bristol Square | 80171 | 02-21-78 | HUD |
| | | FINAL | Westpoint Development | 80101 | 02-03-78 | HUD |
| Utah | Salt Lake | FINAL | I-215 Southeast Belt Route, Salt Lake City | 80159 | 02-16-78 | DOT |

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

03-16-78

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

| STATE | COUNTY | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | ORIG AGENCY NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Virginia | York | DRAFT | Dredging Pier B-3, Yorktown Naval Weapons Station | 80136 | 02-10-78 | DOD |
| Washington | King | SUPPLESR | 5, South 272nd Street | 80104 | 02-03-78 | DOT |
| | Kittitas | DRAFT | Cooperative Western Spruce Budworm, 1978 | 80140 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| | Lewis | DRAFT | Lone Tree Unit Plan, Gifford Pinchot NF | 80186 | 02-24-78 | USDA |
| | Okanogan | DRAFT | Cooperative Western Spruce Budworm, 1978 | 80140 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| | Skamania | DRAFT | Lone Tree Unit Plan, Gifford Pinchot NF | 80186 | 02-24-78 | USDA |
| | Whatcom | DRAFT | Cooperative Western Spruce Budworm, 1978 | 80140 | 02-13-78 | USDA |
| West Virginia | Raleigh | DRAFT | Soak and Piney Creeks Watershed | 80130 | 02-08-78 | USDA |
| Wisconsin | | DRAFT | Abandonment of Rail Service, Southwest Wisconsin | 80137 | 02-10-78 | ICC |
| | Monroe | FINAL | Tri-Creek Watershed | 80122 | 02-07-78 | USDA |

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

03-16-

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

| AGENCY / BUREAU | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | NTIS ORDER NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Chicago-Midway Low Fare Route Proceeding | 80154 | 02-15-78 | (none) |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | | |
| Animal and Plant Health Inspec. Service | | | | | |
| | FINAL | N.Y. Animal Import Center, Stewart Airport | 80138 | 02-09-78 | (none) |
| Forest Service | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Kootenai N.F., Keeler Planning Unit | 80115 | 02-07-78 | (none) |
| | | Fremont NF Timber Management Plan, Lakeview | 80133 | 02-09-78 | (none) |
| | | Cooperative Western Spruce Budworm, 1978 | 80140 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | Hot Point Land Management Plan, Nezperce NF | 80141 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | Mendocino National Forest, Timber Management Plan | 80142 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | Lone Tree Unit Plan, Gifford Pinchot NF | 80186 | 02-28-78 | (none) |
| | FINAL | Badger-Jordon Unit Plan, Hood N.F. | 80109 | 02-06-78 | (none) |
| | | Beaverhead & Deerlodge N.F. Land Use Plan | 80163 | 02-17-78 | (none) |
| | | San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F. | 80169 | 02-21-78 | (none) |
| | | Eagle Aspen Unit Plan, White River N.F. | 80172 | 02-22-78 | (none) |
| Rural Electrification Administration | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Thomas Hill Unit 3, Mine Expansion, Transmission | 80180 | 02-23-78 | |
| | FINAL | Beluga Sta. # 7,8,9-Bernice Lake Unit 3 | 80147 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | Boardman Coal Plant | 80148 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | SUPPLEM | Antelope Valley Station, Two 455 MW Units | 80124 | 02-08-78 | (none) |
| Soil Conservation Service | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Soak and Piney Creeks Watershed | 80130 | 02-06-78 | (none) |
| | | Walnut Roundway Watershed | 80146 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | FINAL | Deposit Watershed, New York | 80105 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| | | Tri-Creek Watershed | 80122 | 02-07-78 | (none) |
| | | Canon Watershed Project | 80170 | 02-21-78 | (none) |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Navy | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Dredging Pier B-3, Yorktown Naval Weapons Station | 80136 | 02-10-78 | (none) |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Air Force | | | | | |
| | FINAL | Space Shuttle Program, Vandenberg AFB | 80118 | 02-07-78 | (none) |

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

03-16-78

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

| AGENCY / BUREAU | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | NTIS ORDER NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Army Corps | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks | 80152 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | Flood Control, Central and Southern Florida | 80162 | 02-17-78 | (none) |
| | | Pillar Point Marina, Regulatory Permit | 80172 | 02-21-78 | (none) |
| | | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Chocolate Bayou | 80182 | 02-23-78 | (none) |
| | | Taylorsville Lake Project | 80192 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | | Cache Creek Basin, Clear Lake | 80195 | 02-28-78 | (none) |
| | FINAL | Big Creek Flood Protection Project | 80131 | 02-08-78 | (none) |
| | | Davenport Local Flood Protection | 80167 | 02-21-78 | (none) |
| | SUPPLEM | Sun River Flood Protection Project | 80106 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| | | Channel/Levee Improvement, East Fork Trinity River | 80168 | 02-17-78 | (none) |
| DEPARTMENT OF HUD | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Tallow Wood Subdivision | 80102 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| | | Highland Creek Village Subdivision | 80103 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| | | Cornerstones Subdivision | 80125 | 02-07-78 | (none) |
| | | Meadow Bend Subdivision, League City | 80132 | 02-08-78 | (none) |
| | | Hillshire Subdivision | 80153 | 02-15-78 | (none) |
| | | Park Meadows Subdivision, Deer Park | 80157 | 02-16-78 | (none) |
| | | Yerba Buena Center, Urban Renewal Plan | 80158 | 02-16-78 | (none) |
| | | Foster Village, Windcrest Park and Bristol Square | 80171 | 02-21-78 | (none) |
| | | Colony Creek Village, Subdivision | 80189 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | | Blair Village Apartment Complex, Proposed sale | 80191 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | | College Park Estates Subdivision | 80198 | 02-28-78 | (none) |
| | FINAL | Westpoint Development | 80101 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| | | Lonergan Lake Disposition | 80111 | 02-06-78 | (none) |
| | | Willowridge Subdivision | 80168 | 02-21-78 | (none) |
| | | Charterwood Subdivision | 80175 | 02-23-78 | (none) |
| | | Greengate Place and Birnam Wood | 80178 | 02-23-78 | (none) |
| | | Riverside Green & Riverside Hills Subdivisions | 80181 | 02-23-78 | (none) |
| | | Autumn Run and Bear Creek Subdivisions | 80196 | 02-28-78 | (none) |
| Section 104(h) | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Redevelopment Site of Hotel Syracuse | 80128 | 02-08-78 | (none) |
| | | Noise Exposure, Stapleton and Buckley Airports | 80143 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR | | | | | |
| Bureau of Land Management | FINAL | Proposed Foothills Project | 80156 | 02-16-78 | (none) |
| Bureau of Outdoor Recreation | FINAL | Missouri R., Nat'l Wild & Scenic Rivers System | 80183 | 02-23-78 | (none) |
| Bureau of Reclamation | SUPPLEM | Garrison Diversion Plan | 80098 | 02-02-78 | (none) |

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

| AGENCY / BUREAU | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | NTIS ORDER NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DEPARTMENT OF LABOR | | | | | |
| | FINAL | DBCP Occupational Exposure Standard | 80179 | 02-23-78 | (none) |
| DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | | | |
| Federal Aviation Administration | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Menominee County Airport, Runway Construction | 80117 | 02-01-78 | (none) |
| | | Cedar Rapids Municipal Airport Runway Construction | 80155 | 02-15-78 | (none) |
| | | Baer Field, Fort Wayne Municipal Airport | 80166 | 02-17-78 | (none) |
| Federal Highway Administration | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Permit, US 321, Middle Fork Creek | 80107 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| | | Keaau-Pahoa Road, Pahoa Bypass, Project RS-0130(17 | 80110 | 02-06-78 | (none) |
| | | Project M 7500 (4), Horizon Drive | 80112 | 02-06-78 | (none) |
| | | I-65-3(52)(53) and M-7257(1), Lewisburg to Warrior | 80113 | 02-06-78 | (none) |
| | | Fort Wayne Bypass, Project No. F-170-2(1) | 80120 | 02-07-78 | (none) |
| | | Corridor Alignment, Improvements of MI-37/51-82 Br | 80129 | 02-08-78 | (none) |
| | | Iowa 14, Project No. F-14-5 | 80135 | 02-09-78 | (none) |
| | | US 221, Marion Bypass | 80138 | 02-10-78 | (none) |
| | | 3rd Street, Southeast Mandan, Improvement | 80139 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | Mar Vista Street, Whittier Blvd. to College Ave. | 80144 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | State Route 1201 at Salter Path | 80150 | 02-14-78 | (none) |
| | | Hospital Loop Road, Lake City | 80161 | 02-17-78 | (none) |
| | | Northeast Inner Loop, Sioux City Bypass | 80176 | 02-22-78 | (none) |
| | | Basin Ave. and Going Str. Interchange, Greeley Ave | 80187 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | | Route 91 Freeway and Harbor Freeway Interchange | 80188 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | | US 50 Study Improvements, Vienna | 80190 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | | US 51, 5th Avenue to Lakeview Drive, Rochelle | 80194 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | | Relocation of US 278, Gadsden to Piedmont | 80197 | 02-28-78 | (none) |
| | FINAL | Brookwood Sta. Area Improvements, I-85, I-75 | 80118 | 02-01-78 | (none) |
| | | I-85, Fulton-DeKalb Co. to I-285 | 80119 | 02-01-78 | (none) |
| | | US 54 Improvement, Wichita | 80145 | 02-13-78 | (none) |
| | | I-215 Southeast Belt Route, Salt Lake City | 80159 | 02-16-78 | (none) |
| | SUPPLEMSR | 5, South 272nd Street | 80104 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| | | I-90 to Beaux Point, 4(f) Lake Chautagua | 80173 | 02-21-78 | (none) |
| | | K-7 at Bonner Springs (5-3) | 80193 | 02-27-78 | (none) |
| | SUPPLE | MI-77 and US 74 Connector, Charlotte | 80123 | 02-07-78 | (none) |
| | FINAL | MA-25 and MA-28, Wareham, Plymouth, and Bourne | 80126 | 02-07-78 | (none) |
| U.S. Coast Guard | DRAFT | Tanker Safety and Pollution Prevention | 80099 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMIN. | DRAFT | Proton-Proton Storage Accelerator Facility | 80149 | 02-14-78 | (none) |

FROM 02-01-78
TO 02-28-78

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

03-16-78

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

| AGENCY / BUREAU | STATUS | STATEMENT TITLE | ACCESSION NUMBER | DATE FILED | NTIS ORDER NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Trimble County Generating Station, Permit | 80127 | 02-08-78 | (none) |
| | | Proposed Expansion of Existing WWT Facilities | 80151 | 02-14-78 | (none) |
| | | Metropolitan Area WWT Facilities, Columbus | 80165 | 02-17-78 | (none) |
| | | National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Lead | 80174 | 02-22-78 | (none) |
| | SUPPLEM | Jerome Wastewater Facilities Project (S-1) | 80108 | 02-06-78 | (none) |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Southeast Federal Center | 80100 | 02-03-78 | (none) |
| INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Abandonment of Rail Service, Southwest Wisconsin | 80137 | 02-10-78 | (none) |
| NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION | | | | | |
| | SUPPLEM | Palisades Nuclear Generating Plant (S-2) | 80121 | 02-07-78 | (none) |
| | | Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station Unit No. 1 | 80184 | 02-24-78 | (none) |
| STATE DEPARTMENT | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Antarctic Living Marine Resources | 80097 | 02-01-78 | (none) |
| VETERANS ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| | DRAFT | Bay Pines, VA Center, Improvements | 80185 | 02-24-78 | (none) |

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Contact: Mr. Barry Flamm
Coordinator
Environmental Quality Activities
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Room 307A
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-6827

### Animal and Plant Health Inspec. Service

Final — Date

**N.Y. Animal Import Center, Stewart Airport** — 02/09

New York
County: Orange
Proposed is the construction of an Animal Import Center on approximately 81 acres of land at the Stewart Airport near Newburgh, New York. The new facility will replace a presently outdated similar facility in Clifton, New Jersey. To provide complete isolation the Import Center will be located within a fenced compound and will contain nineteen buildings. Construction-related impacts are anticipated.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOT EPA DOI
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80134)

### Forest Service

Draft — Date

**Mendocino National Forest, Timber Management Plan** — 02/13

California
County: several
The proposed action involves revising the existing Timber Management Plan which establishes a timber harvesting level and schedule for the Mendocino National Forest for the next decade beginning FY-78. The objective of the plan is to provide a 10 year schedule of harvest and regeneration which provides for sustained yield under a legal requirement for non-declining yields into the future. The proposed action is consistent with the multiple use objectives of approved land management plans for the area.
USDA-FS-R5-DES(Adm)-78-4
(ELR ORDER # 80142)

**Hot Point Land Management Plan, Nezperce NF** — 02/13

Idaho

County: Idaho
The proposed action involves the implemention of a land management plan for the Hot Point Planning Unit, Selway Ranger District, Nezperce National Forest, Idaho County, Idaho. This proposal is both a land management plan and an environmental statement. The Forest Service presents resource information, resource allocation decisions, and management guidelines and documents public involvement. The 15,429 acre planning unit is divided into nine management units for the purpose of resource allocation and direction.
USDA-FS-R1(17)DES(ADM)78-7
(ELR ORDER # 80141)

Kootenai N.F., Keeler Planning Unit 02/07

Montana Idaho
Proposed is the implementation of the revised multiple use plan for the Keeler Planning Unit, Troy Ranger District, Kootenai National Forest located in Lincoln County, Montana and Bonner County, Idaho. The proposed Management Plan affects about 46,887 acres of National Forest land which has been stratified into twelve management situations. Alternatives include: greater emphasis on economic development through more intensive use of the renewable natural resources; and greater emphasis on enhancement of environmental quality and retention of the area's natural qualities, including recommendations for wilderness proposals.
(ELR ORDER # 80115)

Fremont NF Timber Management Plan, Lakeview 02/09

Oregon
This EIS describes the Lakeview Federal Sustained-Yield Unit of the Fremont National Forest and assesses the environmental effects which would result from implementing alternative Timber Management Plans. Environmental effects include economic and social factors related to human survival and well-being, factors affecting the continuance of other life forms, and aesthetic factors not strictly related to ecological functions, but important to man's enjoyment of the Forest. The effective period of the proposed Plan would be October 1, 1978 through September 30, 1988.
USDA-FS-R6-DES(adm)78-4
(ELR ORDER # 80133)

Cooperative Western Spruce Budworm, 1978 02/13

Washington
County: Whatcom Kittitas Okanogan
Proposed is the management of western spruce budworm on 1.2 million acres of forest in north-central Washington. The EIS covers all affected lands, regardless of ownership

or land management objectives, including lands administered by the USDA Forest Service, USDI National Park Service, and State and private lands in Whatcom, Okanogan, and Kittitas Counties, Washington.
USDA-FS-R6-DES(Adm)-78-6
(ELR ORDER # 80140)

Lone Tree Unit Plan, Gifford Pinchot NF 02/24

Washington
County: Lewis Skamania
This proposed action describes alternative managment plans for National Forest land in the Lone Tree Planning Unit, located in Lewis and Skamania Counties, Washington. Included is 1,480 acres of private land and 113,370 acres of National Forest land administered by the Gifford Pinchot National Forest's Randle Ranger District. The Lone Tree Unit is one of 16 such units on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. The geographic center of the unit is about 65 airline miles northeast of Vancouver, Washington and Portland Oregon metropolitan area and 70 miles southeast of the Seattle/Tacoma area.
USDA-FS-R6-FES(ADM)-78-5
(ELR ORDER # 80186)

Final Date

San Gabriel Unit, Angeles N.F. 02/21

California
County: San Bernardino Los Angeles
This statement proposes several alternative land use management plans for the 186,570-acre San Gabriel Planning Unit, Angeles National Forest, California. The unit includes the 36,000-acre San Gabriel Wilderness, the 5,800-acre Cucamonga Inventoried Roadless Area, the 59,000-acre Sheep Mountain Wilderness Study Area, the 6,060-acre San Dimas undeveloped area, and the 17,000-acre San Dimas Experimental Forest. Impacts vary according to the alternative slected.
USDA-FS-R5-DES(adm)77-05
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOT HEW LAB DOI COE EPA FPC CGD
State and Local Agencies
Organizations and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80169)

Eagle Aspen Unit Plan, White River N.F. 02/22

Colorado
County: Eagle Pitkin
Proposed is the implementation of a revised Land Management plan for the 550,000 acre Eagle-Aspen Unit in White River National Forest in Colorado. Opportunities to be provided include 563,000 visitor days of developed recreation and 408,000 visitor days of dispersed recreation. Management of

forest stand for wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities are protected to contribute to an estimated annual yield of 2.5 MMBF of timber. Present opportunities for domestic grazing will be maintained, opportunities will also be provided for wildlife solitude and protection or enhancement of big game winter range.
USDA-FS-R2-fes-(adm)fy-77-03
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI EPA FEA
State and Local Agencies
Business/Organizations and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80177)

Beaverhead & Deerlodge N.F. Land Use Plan 02/17

Montana
County: several
The proposed action is the implementation of a land management plan for Beaverhead National Forest and portions of Deerlodge National Forest, located in Beaverhead, Madison, Gallatin, Silver Bow and Deerlodge Counties, Montana. The plan covers 7 planning units containing 52 management units on 2,166,971 acres. Moderate to high emphasis is placed on wildlife and recreation opportunities and moderate emphasis on wood fiber, livestock forage and wilderness.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA HEW FPC ERDA FEA DOI DOT
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80163)

Badger-Jordon Unit Plan, Hood N.F. 02/06

Oregon
County: Wasco Hood
Proposed is a land use management plan for the Badger-Jordon Planning Unit, Mt. Hood National Forest. The plan applies to approximately 58,000 acres within the National Forest boundary, of which 21,200 acres were inventoried by the Forest Service and reported in the final EIS for Roadless and Undeveloped Areas filed on October 15, 1973. Unavoidable adverse effects include increases in water, litter, and noise pollution, and increased risk of fire from more use and a fuels buildup.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOT EPA HUD PRBC
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80109)

## Rural Electrification Administration

Draft Date

Thomas Hill Unit 3, Mine Expansion, Transmission 02/23

Mississippi
County: Randolph Chariton
This action concerns the use of REA guaranteed loan funds to finance the proposed new Thomas Hill Unit 3, 610-MW-net base load, coal-fired steam electric generating unit located in Randolph County, Missouri. The mine expansion is located in Chariton and Randolph Counties. The new 135 mile, 345 KV transmission line will be constructed to interconnect the Thomas Hill Plant substation with Franks substation via a new intermediate substation at Kingdom City. The transmission line will traverse several counties in Missouri.
USDA-REA-EIS(ADM)78-2-D.
(ELR ORDER # 80180)

Final Date

Beluga Sta. # 7,8,9-Bernice Lake Unit 3 02/13

Alaska
Proposed is the granting of financial assistance to Chugach Electric Association for the construction of additional generating capacity at the Beluga Station and the Bernice Lake Power Plant in Alaska. Also included in the application are additions to the 230 KV transmission system. Plans include expansion of Units 7,8, and 9 at the Beluga Station, located 40 air miles west and across Cook Inlet from Anchorage, and expansion of Unit 3 at the Bernice Lake Power Plant, located at Nikiski, within the Kenai Penninsula Borough.
USDA-REA-ES(Adm)-76-14-F
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOD DOT DOC DOI USDA
State and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80147)

Boardman Coal Plant 02/13

Oregon
County: Morrow
Proposed is the use of REA financing by Pacific Northwest Generating Company for a 10% share of the Boardman Coal Plant and associated transmission and support facilities. The project includes a 1400-acre cooling reservoir, a 500-acre ash disposal area, a 500 kV transmission line (approximately 17 miles) and a 230 kV transmission line (approximately 17.5 miles). Operation of the unit will result in the emission of nitrogen and sulfur oxides. Transmission right-of-way will require approximately 1,650 acres of land for the 39 miles of lines. Air and noise pollution levels will be increased.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI USDA ERDA
State and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80148)

Supplement — Date

Antelope Valley Station, Two 455 MW Units — 02/08

North Dakota
This Supplement to the DEIS relates to a request for a loan guarantee commitment from the REA for Basin Electric Power Cooperative of Bismarck, North Dakota. The proposed loan guarantee commitment would provide financial assistance for the construction of two 455 MW lignite-fired generating units to be installed near Beulah, North Dakota, associated transmission facilities, and coal mining equipment. The supplement expands upon possible alternate plant site locations for Antelope Valley Project. This information supplements the material presented in the DEIS which was made available to the public on September 27, 1977. USDA-REA-EIS(Adm) 77-6-D
(ELR ORDER # 80124)

## Soil Conservation Service

Draft — Date

Walnut Roundway Watershed — 02/13

Louisiana
County: Madison East Carroll
The proposed project is for watershed protection, flood prevention, and agricultural water management in the Walnut-Roundway Watershed in Madison and East Carroll Parishes, Louisiana. Planned structural measures to be installed consist of about 248 miles of channel work for flood prevention drainage together with appurtenant measures for channel protection and maintenance access. In addition 15 structures including five weirs, six dams in existing channels or streams, two grade stabilization and two water control structures to minimize damages to fish and wildlife will be installed.
USDA-SCS-EIS-WS-(ADM)-2-78-(D)-LA
(ELR ORDER # 80146)

Soak and Piney Creeks Watershed — 02/08

West Virginia
County: Raleigh
The Soak Creek Watershed is located in Raleigh County, in southern West Virginia. It includes all of the drainage area of Soak Creek from its headwaters to its confluence with Piney Creek, an area of about 3,690 acres of 5.8 square miles. The watershed has a population of about 3,500 people. The only incorporated town in the watershed is Sophia with a 1970 population of 1,300 people.
USDA-SCS-EIS-WS(ADM)78-2-D-WV
(ELR ORDER # 80130)

Final — Date

Canon Watershed Project — 02/21

Colorado
County: Fremont
Proposed is the application and installation of project land treatment and flood prevention structural measures for Canon City, Colorado. The project would protect 1,016 acres of agricultural, suburban, and urban land, including 650 residential and 50 commercial properties. The objective of the action is to reduce floodwater runoff, erosion and sediment damage, and repair costs to agricultural lands, residential and commercial properties and other structures. A temporary increase in sediment would occur on 240 acres and residences and homes would be displaced.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT EPA USDA DOI
State and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80170)

Deposit Watershed, New York — 02/03

New York
County: Broome Chenango Delaware
proposed is a project for watershed protection and flood prevention in Broome, Chenango, and Delaware Counties, New York. The planned works of improvement include conservation land treatment supplemented by two floodwater retarding structures, channel work, and dikes in residential and agricultural areas. Installation of structures will result in the commitment of 4 acres of pasture, 18 acres of open land formerly cropped, 3 acres of forest land, 2 acres of urban land, and 900 feet of intermittent stream. Short term increases in sediment and turbidity will also result.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOD HEW DOI USDA EPA
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80105)

Tri-Creek Watershed — 02/07

Wisconsin
County: Monroe
Proposed is a project for watershed protection, flood prevention, and recreational development in Monroe County, Wisconsin. To date, one floodwater retarding structure (No. 1) has been installed at a cost of about $1,039,000 and land treatment measures have been installed at a cost of about $104,700. The remaining planned works of improvement include conservation land treatment, four floodwater retarding structures, and one multiple-purpose structure for flood prevention and recreation. Adverse effects include increased air and noise pollution and the elimination of 32 acres of cropland, 66

acres of forestland, and 6 acres of grassland.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOD DOC HEW DOI DOT EPA
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80122)

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Contact: Mr. Ivars V. Mellups
Office of the General Counsel
Civil Aeronautics Board
1825 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20428
(202) 673-5205

Draft — Date

Chicago-Midway Low Fare Route Proceeding — 02/15

This draft environmental impact statement has been prepared in conjunction with the Chicago Midway Low-Fare Proceeding, Docket 30277. At issue in this proceeding is whether the Civil Aeronautics Board should authorize new service between Chicago's Midway Airport and the Cities of Detroit, St. Louis, Cleveland, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, and Minneapolis/St. Paul. There are five active applicants for new authority. The proponents of this action cite two primary benefits. First, the traveling public would experience lower fares and secondly, Midway Airport would be revitalized.
(ELR ORDER # 80154)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Air Force

Contact: Col. Luis F. Dominguez
Department of the Air Force
Room 5D431, Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20330
(202) 697-7799

Final — Date

Space Shuttle Program, Vandenberg AFB — 02/07

California
County: Santa Barbara
The proposed action comprises construction, activation, and operation of Space Shuttle facilities at Vandenberg AFB and Port Hueneme Harbor, Calif. There are seven elements in the proposed action, namely: landing strip extension and other modifications; new Orbiter processing facilities adjacent to VAFB; new facilities at Port Hueneme Harbor to receive, process, and store Shuttle External Tanks (ETs)and recovered spent Solid Rocket Boosters (SRBs) delivered by sea; new marine facility on the VAFB coast for receipt of ETs and SRBs;a tow route for transporting the Orbiter; and modified, expanded support facilities at SLC-6 for handling of cyrogenic propellants.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOD HEW DOI NASA DOT AHP
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80114)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Army Corps

Contact: Dr. C. Grant Ash
Office of Environmental Policy Department
Attn: DAEN-CWR-P
Office of the Chief of Engineers
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20314
(202) 693-6795

Draft — Date

Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks — 02/13

California
County: Contra Costa
Proposed is the water resources project for channel improvement on Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks located in Contra Costa County, California. The proposal includes minimal construction in salt marshes; earthen floodways; concrete culverts; an open trapezoidal concrete channel; and selected channel clearing to the end of the project. Mitigation of adverse impacts on cultural resources will be included.
(ELR ORDER # 80152)

Pillar Point Marina, Regulatory Permit — 02/21

California
County: San Mateo
The San Mateo County Harbor District, El Granada, California has applied for a permit to develop a marina at the North end of Half Moon Bay near the communities of El Granada and Princeton within the confines of the existing breakwaters, built in 1961. The project site is located approximately 20 miles south of San Francisco. Environmental impacts include: change in air and water quality; change in traffic and noise levels; improved aesthetics; enlarged water-related recreational facilities; growth inducement; and change in tax revenue.
(ELR ORDER # 80172)

Cache Creek Basin, Clear Lake — 02/28

California
County: Yolo Lake
The proposed plan includes construction of flood control facilities at the outlet of Clear Lake in Lake County, California, to provide flood protection to existing and future urban and agricultural development on the Clear Lake rim. The plan calls for widening and deepening the existing Clear Lake Outlet Channel, constructing a bypass channel, constructing a diversion control structure and weir, and requiring future development to flood proof to the elevation of the preproject flood plain. The plan also

includes sediment control on Cache Creek in Yolo County, California, to preserve the integrity of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project.
(ELR ORDER # 80195)

Flood Control, Central and Southern Florida 02/17

Florida
County: Hendry
Proposed is the Hendry County segment of the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control Project. This section of the proposal consists of a canal and control structure designed to remove flood waters more efficiently and prevent overdrainage of a 261 sq.mi. area in eastern Hendry County. With an integrated pumping station and canal system, the project will also provide for the conveyance of agricultural water supply from Lake Okeechobee during periods of drought for distribution to part of the project area and to Big Cypress Seminole Indian Reservation which is located about 5 miles south of the project area.
(ELR ORDER # 80162)

Taylorsville Lake Project 02/27

Kentucky
County: Anderson Nelson Spencer
Proposed is the Taylorsville Lake Project in Spencer, Anderson and Nelson Counties, Kentucky. The dam site is situated four river miles upstream from Taylorsville, Kentucky, about 60 river miles above the mouth of the Salt River. This multi-purpose lake project, located about 26 miles southeast of Louisville, will provide flood control, general recreation, fish wildlife recreation, and water quality control. Completion of the project as proposed will provide flood reduction to downstream lands along the Salt and Ohio Rivers, improve downstream water quality and provide water oriented recreational opportunities for an estimated 1.4 million vistors per year.
(ELR ORDER # 80192)

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Chocolate Bayou 02/23

Texas
County: Brazoria
The proposed Federal action is the improvement of the existing Chocolate Bayou navigation channel project in Brazoria County, Texas and construction of a saltwater barrier in the bayou upstream of Liverpool, Texas. The proposed improvements consist of enlargement and all future maintenance of the existing locally constructed shallow-draft channel in Chocolate Bay and the lower reaches of Chocolate Bayou from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) to channel mile 8.2 and construction of a saltwater barrier in Chocolate Bayou about 16.9 miles above the GIWW.
(ELR ORDER # 80182)

Final — Date

Davenport Local Flood Protection — 02/21

Iowa
County: Scott
The recommended plan provides flood control to the Davenport area and floodwalls along the Mississippi River between I-280 and the Government Bridge, modification of the channel of Blackhawk Creek, and selective structural protection for the water treatment plant. Mahant Marsh will be acquired by the City of Davenport and preserved as a natural study area. Installation of water control structures will facilitate environmental enhancement of the marsh. Installation of culverts in the upstream end of the levee crossing Credit Island Slough will restore water flow through the slough.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI DOC USDA DOT HUD HEW
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80167)

Big Creek Flood Protection Project — 02/08

Ohio
County: Cuyahoga
The proposed project consists of construction of a floodway and diversion channel in Cleveland, Ohio. The facility includes 4,250 feet of floodway, and extends from near the upstream side of Cleveland Zoo to the downstream side of Protector Products. The project will provide 100-year flood protection for recreational and industrial facilities. Seventeen acres of flood plain will be altered and seven acres of woodland will be lost.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOI DOT EPA
State and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80131)

Supplement — Date

Sun River Flood Protection Project — 02/03

Montana
County: Great Falls
This draft supplement No. 4 presents the reevaluation of the project economics for the flood protection project on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana originally presented in Section X of Design Memorandum No. MGF-1, July 1966, revised October 1965. Since the area is in a stable economic setting, relative to potential future changes in flood potential, and is economically feasible based on damage reduction to existing development alone. Benefits are based on a 100 year project life discounted at 6.625 percent. Land use and damage data collected after the flood in 1975 were used in this analysis.
(ELR ORDER # 80106)

Channel/Levee Improvement, East Fork Trinity River 02/17

Texas
County: Kaufman
This supplemental statement updates information on the environmental statement relative to the Increment I portion of the East Fork Channel and Levee Improvement of the authorized project, Lavon Reservoir Enlargement and East Fork Channel and Levee Improvement. The final EIS for Lavon Dam and Reservoir Modification and East Fork Channel Improvement was filed with CEQ on March 29, 1971 and is considered inadequate by current standards. An updated EIS on the Lavon Dam and Reservoir was filed with CEQ on July 23, 1976. This proposal will improve channel and utilized excavated material to raise and strengthen associated levees to protect agricultural lands from flooding.
(ELR ORDER # 80164)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, Navy

Draft | Date

Dredging Pier R-3, Yorktown Naval Weapons Station | 02/10

Virginia
County: York

The proposed project involves increasing the depth of the area adjacent to the Naval Weapon Station R-3 from 36 ft. at MLW to 42 ft. at MLW and 2 ft. overdepth. The project involves the following: dredging along the working face of Pier R-3, and in a general northward direction toward the York River channel to the point, obtaining the new project depth which is a distance of approx. 1500 ft. out board of the working face of the pier; and disposing of about 445,000 cubic yards of dredge material in a dredge spoil disposal site which has been used for spoils disposal in a previous project.
(ELR ORDER # 80136)

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMIN.

Contact: Mr. W. Herbert Pennington
Office of NEPA Coordination
Energy Research and Development Administration
E-201, ERDA
Washington, D.C. 20545
(301) 353-4241

Draft — Date

Proton-Proton Storage Accelerator Facility — 02/14

New York
County: Suffolk

Proposed is the construction and operation of a Proton-Proton Storage Accelerator Facility (Isabelle), Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, Suffolk County, New York. The Isabelle accelerator will be used for advanced research in the high energy physics program by the Department of Energy and will provide higher levels of interaction than are presently available.

DOE/EIS-0003-D
(ELR ORDER # 80149)

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Contact: Mr. Peter Cook
Director, Office of Federal Activities
Room WSMW 537, 401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 755-0780

Draft — Date

**National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Lead** — 02/22

Under Section 109 of the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency intends to propose a National Ambient Air Quality Standard for lead. The sources and 1974 ambient air concentrations of lead, trends in growth, and the existence and potential for lead emissions control have been summarized. Emission control strategies have been developed and, under one strategy developed, the nationwide environmental impacts of establishing the standard have been assessed.
(ELR ORDER # 80174)

**Trimble County Generating Station, Permit** — 02/06

Kentucky
County: Trimble
The proposed action was prepared by the Region IV office of the Environmental Protection Agency as the lead Federal Agency. The purpose of this statement is to fulfill the requirements of the NEPA and the preparation of EIS's for New Source NPDES Permits (40 CFR 6.900). The proposed project requires commitment of a 1000 acre site for construction of two 495 MW generating units, one operational in 1983 and the other in 1985, and two 675 MW generating units, one operational in 1987 and the other in 1989.
EPA 904/9-78-001
(ELR ORDER # 80127)

**Proposed Expansion of Existing WWT Facilities** — 02/14

Nebraska
County: Scotts Bluff
The proposed project is the granting of financial assistance for the improvements of publicly owned sewage treatment plants in Scotts Bluff County, Nebraska. The municipalities which own and operate these facilities are Gering, Scottsbluff, and Terrytown, Nebraska. Together these municipalities constitute the major trade and manufacturing center in the Nebraska Panhandle. This EIS was prepared to evaluate the potential effects of these proposed actions upon the North Platte River, Scotts Bluff County, and the surrounding area.
EPA-907/9-77-008
(ELR ORDER # 80151)

Metropolitan Area WWT Facilities, Columbus 02/17

Ohio
County: Franklin
The subject action is the approval of the facilities plans for the City of Columbus and the Board of Franklin County Commissioners for the preparation of plans to expand and upgrade wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal facilities within the Columbus metropolitan area. The proposed project includes selection of additional liquid treatment facilities for sewage processing; design and construction of pilot plants; construction of three sludge incinerators; construction of separate sanitary sewer interceptors; and the selection of a cost-effective and environmentally acceptable system to minimize combined sewer overflows. EPA-5-OH-FRANKLIN-COLUMBUS-WWTP&INT-77
(ELR ORDER # 80165)

Supplement Date

Jerome Wastewater Facilities Project (S-1) 02/06

Idaho
County: Jerome
This Addendum identifies the alternatives which were evaluated in a Final EIS, dated March 29, 1977, and proposes that alternative #4 be constructed to meet the needs of the residents and maintain environmental quality. This city service area presently consists of about 1,170 acres of land and has a present population of about 6500 residents. The project will expand the service area to 5,030 acres to serve a forecasted population of 14,200 people by the year 1996.
(ELR ORDER # 80108)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Mr. Andrew E. Kauders
Executive Director, Environmental Affairs Division
General Services Administration
18th and F streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20405
(202) 566-0405

Draft Date

Southeast Federal Center 02/03
District of Columbia
Proposed is the development of the 60.5 acre Southeast Federal Center site (Navy Yard Annex) as a 15,000 employee administrative office complex. This site is located in the southeast area of Washington, DC and is bounded by the Anacostia River to the south, First street to the west and M street to the north. Implementation of the proposed action is expected to take 20 years, beginning in 1980 and extending through the year 2000.
EDC 78001
(ELR ORDER # 80100)

## DEPARTMENT OF HUD

Contact: Mr. Richard H. Broun
Director, Office of Environmental Quality
Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-6308

Draft — Date

**Yerba Buena Center, Urban Renewal Plan** — 02/16

California
County: San Francisco
The Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment area encompasses 87.3 acres of land situated to the southeast of San Francisco's financial and downtown retail districts in the area known locally as the "South of Market". The redevelopment was intended to eliminate substandard buildings and blighted surroundings and to provide land for re-use for activities appropriate to the downtown location. The project is now well into execution; most of the land scheduled for clearance has been cleared and some of the proposed re-uses have already been built.
HUD-R09-EIS-78-2D
(ELR ORDER # 80158)

**Blair Village Apartment Complex, Proposed Sale** — 02/27

Georgia
County: Fulton
The proposed action is the sale of the Blair Village Apartment complex which was acquired by the Department of Housing and Urban Development on December 2, 1975 through foreclosure on a FHA insured mortgage. Blair Village is a 1,062 unit apartment development located in southeastern Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia.
HUD-R04-EIS-78-02-D
(ELR ORDER # 80191)

**College Park Estates Subdivision** — 02/28

South Carolina
County: Berkeley
Proposed is the development of College Park Estates located in southwestern Berkeley County, South Carolina, approximately 16 miles northwest of Charleston, five miles southeast of Summerville and three miles west of the City of Goose Creek. College Park is a planned community development that will consist of approximately 1600 single family residences on approximately 650 acres, when the final project phases are completed. Other land uses in this area include school and recreational sites within the project area. College Park is proposed to be totally

developed over a period of approximately 15 years.
HUD-R04-EIS-77-14D
(ELR ORDER # 80198)

Hillshire Subdivision 02/15

Tennessee
County: Shelby
The project site of approximately 280 acres lies in northeast Shelby County, Tennessee along Fletcher Creek just east and north of the Memphis city limits. The project proposes to develop this site in single-family, multi-family, commercial and office land uses, in accordance with existing zoning regulations and Memphis and Shelby County land use planning. The Hillshire project would be compatible with anticipated growth and development, natural environment in and around the site, and would involve no endangered species habitat; noise levels, air quality and water quality would remain within acceptable limits.
HUD-R04-EIS-77-26-D
(ELR ORDER # 80153)

Tallow Wood Subdivision 02/03

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is for the Department of HUD to accept some 224 acres of land located in the northwestern portion of Harris County, Texas, for HUD-FHA Home Mortgage Insurance under Section 203(B) of Title II of the National Housing Act of 1943. It is proposed that this tract of land be developed into a subdivision composed primarily of single family dwellings (approximately 1000 units).
(ELR ORDER # 80102)

Highland Creek Village Subdivision 02/03

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to accept 541 acres for the Highland Creek Village Subdivision located in Harris County, Texas, for HUD-FHA mortgage insurance under section 203(B) of Title II of the National Housing Act of 1943. When complete the subdivision will contain approximately 2,400 single family homes. Beneficial impacts include providing needed housing with the growing community.
HUD-R06-EIS-78-9-D
(ELR ORDER # 80103)

Cornerstones Subdivision 02/07

Texas
County: Harris Fort Bend

The proposed action is for HUD to accept for HUD-FHA Home Mortgage Insurance purposes under Section 203(b) of Title II of the National Housing Act of 1934, the proposed Cornerstones subdivision located in the far western part of Harris County and the northeastern part of Fort Bend County, Texas. When completed, the subdivision will contain about 2,047 single family homes plus recreational facilites to serve the subdivision.
(HUD-R06-EIS-78-8-D)
(ELR ORDER # 80125)

Meadow Bend Subdivision, League City 02/08

Texas
County: Galveston
The purpose and intent of this environmental impact statement is to identify and evaluate the environmental consequences of developing 379 acres of agricultural land into a residential area in League City, Texas. The residential area, Meadow Bend, as proposed will ultimately consist of about 1,485 single-family units for which FHA mortgage insurance is being considered. The development provides for the planning of living accommodations for approximately 5,570 people.
HUD-R06-EIS-78-11D
(ELR ORDER # 80132)

Park Meadows Subdivision, Deer Park 02/16

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to accept for HUD-FHA home mortgage insurance purposes under section 203 (b) of Title II of the National Housing Act of 1934, some 267 acres of land located in the City of Deer Park, Harris County, Texas. It is proposed that this tract of land be developed into a subdivision composed primarily of single family dwellings (approximately 1000 units).
HUD-R06-EIS-78-10D
(ELR ORDER # 80157)

Foster Village, Windcrest Park and Bristol Square 02/21

Texas
County: Tarrant
Proposed is the 633-acre development consisting of three independent, but adjacent subdivisions located in Watauga and North Richland Hills, Tarrant County, Texas. The Foster Village, Windcrest Park and Bristol Square Subdivisions are located approximately 12 miles from the Fort Worth Central Business District, and will be designed to accommodate an ultimate population of approximately 6,500 persons.
HUD-R06-EIS-78-12D.
(ELR ORDER # 80171)

Colony Creek Village Subdivision 02/27

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to accept for HUD-FHA mortgage insurance purposes, the proposed Colony Creek Village Subdivision which is located in northwestern Harris County, Texas, about twenty miles northwest of downtown Houston. The 181.73 acre site is north of and adjacent to Lovetta Road. When completed in five years, the subdivision will contain approximately 818 single family homes plus recreational facilities to serve the subdivision.
HUD-R06-EIS-78-14-D
(ELR ORDER # 80189)

Final Date

Lonergan Lake Disposition 02/06

Nebraska
County: Douglas
Proposed is the disposition of a 658-acre tract of land commonly referred to as Lonergan Lake, located to the north of the city of Omaha in Douglas County, Nebraska. HUD committed the tract for FHA mortgage insurance for a planned unit development in 1968. The mortgagee failed to meet his financial obligations and Title was conveyed to the Secretary of the Department of HUD on September 23, 1975. HUD proposes to sell the Lonergan Lake property in accordance with the provisions of the National Housing Act as amended and HUD Handbook 4315.1, Property Disposition, Multifamily.
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP DOI DOT EPA GSA
State, Regional and Local Agencies
Concerned Individuals and Groups
(ELR ORDER # 80111)

Riverside Green & Riverside Hills Subdivisions 02/23

Ohio
County: Franklin
Proposed is the development of two subdivisions in Columbus, Ohio. Riverside Green development involves the subdivison of a 164 acre tract of land into 880 dwelling units, including school and commercial areas. The Riverside Hills project involves the development of a 155 acre tract of land into 568 dwelling units, including space for schools and commercial use. Adverse effects include the removal of vegetation and wildlife habitat, increased storm water run-off, conversion of agricultural land to urban use, and increased traffic and air and noise pollution levels.

HUD-R05-EIS-77-09-(F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA EPA HUD
State and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80181)

Westpoint Development 02/03

Texas
County: Tarrant
Proposed is the acceptance of the 1,311-acre Westpoint Development for mortgage insurance purposes. The development, located on Interstate 20 and West Loop 820 approximately 9 miles west of the Fort Worth Central Business District, is designed to accomodate a 1985 population of 13,300 persons with a housing supply of 4,600 units. Of these housing units, 3,650 are single-family homes and 950 units are apartments, cluster, condominiums, townhome duplexes, and other multi-family units. The proposed development also provides for schools, parks, commercial and shopping centers, and other community facilities.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOT USDA DOI DOD VA
State and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80101)

Willowridge Subdivision 02/21

Texas
County: Harris Fort Bend
Proposed is the development of 4,200 acres into a planned community composed of single-family homes, apartments, patio homes and townhomes with some commercial reserves in Fort Bend and Harris Counties, Texas. The development provides for the planning and controlling of a wide range of living accomodations for approximately 50,000 or more people.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA COE DOT DOI USDA
State and Local agencies
Groups and individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80168)

Charterwood Subdivision 02/23

Texas
County: Harris
Proposed is the acceptance for mortgage insurance purposes of the Charterwood Subdivision in Harris County, Texas. Project plans call for the development of the 292.6988-acre area into a community composed of single-family homes. Adverse effects include the loss of wooded land and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the automobile for transportation.
HUD-R06-EIS-78-6F
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA EPA COE DOT DOI
State and Local Agencies
Special Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80175)

Greengate Place and Birnam Wood 02/23

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is acceptance of, for HUD/FHA home mortgage insurance purposes, some 723 acres of land (368-acre tract of Greengate Place and 255-acre tract of Birnam Wood) located in the northern part of Harris County, Texas. The development of the two tracts located within a mile of each other will be composed primarily of single family dwellings consisting of approximately 3000 units. Adverse effects will be loss of grazing land and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the automobile for transportation.
HUD-R06-EIS-78-5F
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA COE USDA
State and Local Agencies
Special Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80178)

Autumn Run and Bear Creek Subdivisions 02/28

Texas
County: Harris
The proposed action is the acceptance for HUD/FHA home mortgage insurance purposes of Autumn Run and Bear Creek Subdivisions in Harris County, Texas. The 910-acre development will consist of two planned communities, 278-acre Autumn Run and 632-acre Bear Creek, composed of single family housing with recreational facilities. The project will result in an increase of some 10,400 residents in the project area, loss of agricultural lands, and an increased demand for fossil fuels through heavy dependence on the automobile for transportation.
HUD-R06-EIS-78-4F
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA DOD DOI
State and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80196)

Section 104(h)

Draft Date

Noise Exposure, Stapleton and Buckley Airports 02/13

Colorado
County: Adams Arapahoe
The city of Aurora, Colorado proposes to approve the conduct of various federally funded housing programs in the "normally unacceptable" and "clearly unacceptable" noise exposure areas around Stapleton and Buckley Airports. The types of programs include rehabilitation

of existing homes, rent subsidies, and purchase of houses by the Aurora Housing Authority for occupancy by qualifying persons. The location is in Adams and Arapahoe Counties within Aurora's city limits.

(ELR ORDER # 80143)

Redevelopment Site of Hotel Syracuse 02/08

New York
County: Onondaga
The city of Syracuse, New York proposes to apply for Urban Development Action Grant Funds from HUD for the Redevelopment of Hotel Syracuse. As a major element of the project, the Hotel Syracuse will undertake a 200 room addition including a major ballroom and 47,000 sq. ft. of retail space. The City will assist in site preparation for the addition, the installation of public improvements, and will participate in the construction of four, second level pedestrian bridges. In addition, the City will bond for the construction of a 500 car parking facility on the site of an existing City-owned parking garage.
(ELR ORDER # 80128)

## DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Contact: Mr. Bruce Blanchard
Director, Environmental project Review
Room 4256 Interior Bldg.
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-3891

### Bureau of Land Management

Final — Date

**Proposed Foothills Project** — 02/16

Colorado
County: several
Proposed are the construction, operation, and maintenance of water diversion facilities on Federally managed lands on the South Platte River 25 miles southwest of Denver, Colorado as a part of the proposed Foothills Project. The project would also include a water treatment plant with an ultimate capacity of 500 million gallons per day and a conduit distribution system extending into the Denver metropolitan area. Sources of water would include both the South Platte River and the Blue River via Dillon Reservoir and the Harold D. Roberts Tunnel. Adverse effects include the loss of 1.7 miles of free-flowing river.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE EPA FPC HEW DOI
State and Local Agencies
Organizations and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80156)

### Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Final — Date

**Missouri R., Nat'l Wild & Scenic Rivers System** — 02/23

Montana
Proposed is the inclusion of a 128-mile segment of the Missouri River and 147,800 acres of adjacent land in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The segment would be classified as follows: 72 miles wild, 39 miles scenic, and 17 miles recreational under the administration of the Bureau of Land Management and Fish and Wildlife Service. Commercial and residential development would be precluded.
FES-78-3
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE DOD DOI EPA FPC DOT
State and Local Agencies
Interested Organizations
(ELR ORDER # 80183)

**Bureau of Reclamation**

| Supplement | Date |
|---|---|
| Garrison Diversion Plan | 02/02 |

North Dakota
Proposed is the Garrison Diversion Unit, of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin in North Dakota. The Department of the Interior has prepared this draft supplemental environmental impact statement which presents six alternative plans ranging from foregoing additional construction to development of the unit as authorized by Congress in 1965.
DES 78-2
(ELR ORDER # 80098)

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Contact: Mr. Richard I. Chais
Chief, Section of Energy
and Environment
Room 3373
12th & Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20423
(202) 275-7692

| Draft | Date |
|---|---|
| Abandonment of Rail Service, Southwest Wisconsin | 02/10 |

Wisconsin
The action under study involves the proposed abandonment of three rail lines: the Chicago and North Western Transportaion Company (C&NW) branch between Kleveneville and Lancaster, Wisconsin, Docket No. AB 1(Sub-No. 41); the Illinois Central Gulf Railroad Company (ICG) branch between Madison, Wis. and Freeport, Illinois, Docket No. AB 43 (Sub-No. 28); and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company line between Mineral Point and Monroe, Wis., Docket No. AB 7 (Sub-No. 49). All three lines are located in close proximity to one another and serve the same area.
(ELR ORDER # 80137)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Contact: Mr. David R. Bell
Chief, Office of Environmental and Economic
Impact Assessment
Room N-3673
Washington, D.C. 20210
(202)523-7076

Final — Date

DBCP Occupational Exposure Standard — 02/23

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration proposes to regulate employee exposure to DBCP by limiting worker exposures to 1 part per billion on an 8-hour time-weighted average, with a ceiling level of 10 parts per billion as averaged over any 15-minute period during the working day. The proposal also provides for exposure measurements, methods of compliance, regulated areas, training, personal protective equipment, medical surveillance, and record-keeping.

COMMENTS MADE BY: TREA LAB GSA DOE DOI
State and Local Agencies

(ELR ORDER # 80179)

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Contact: Mr. Voss A. Moore
Assistant Director for Environmental Projects
P-518
Washington, D.C. 20555
(301) 492-8446

Supplement — Date

Palisades Nuclear Generating Plant (S-2) — 02/07

Michigan
County: Van Buren
The NRC has issued this final supplement to an EIS filed with CEQ in May 1971. It addresses new information and changes in staff evaluation. The proposed action is the issuance of a full-term operating license at an increased power level to Consumers Power Co. for operation of Palisades Nuclear Power Plant No. 1, in Van Buren Co., Michigan. The plant, located on Lake Michigan, uses a pressurized water reactor to presently produce about 2200 $MW_e$ to generate a net electric output of 686 MWe. Under the proposed action the plant would operate under 2683 MWt and 786 MWe. The cooling tower blowdown will be discharged into Lake Michigan.
(ELR ORDER # 80121)

Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station Unit No. 1 — 02/24

Texas
County: Austin
The proposed action is the issuance of a construction permit to the Houston Lighting and Power Company for the construction of Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 located in Austin County, Texas. This draft supplemental statement has been prepared to update a FEIS filed with CEQ in November 1974. Major changes in the station design include: (1) reduction in gross electrical generating capacity; (2) reduction in the number and size of associated facilities; (3) reduction in the cooling lake surface area; (4) addition of an external dam along the northern lake perimeter; (5) reduction in estimated water use requirements and (6) redesign of waste systems. (NUREG-0428)
(ELR ORDER # 80184)

STATE DEPARTMENT

Contact: Mr. Cameron Sanders
Office of Environmental Affairs
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-9169

Draft | Date

Antarctic Living Marine Resources | 02/01

The United States will participate in the negotiation of a regime to conserve Antarctic marine living resources. All living resources in waters south of the Antarctic convergence, except whales and except seals south of 60 degrees south latitude, are affected. The purpose of the regime would be to ensure that any harvesting of Antarctic marine living resources take place in accordance with sound conservation principles. There are no present or proposed commercial fishing operations by the United States in Antarctic waters.
(ELR ORDER # 80097)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contact: Mr. Martin Convisser, Director
Office of Environmental Affairs
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4357

Federal Aviation Administration

Draft — Date

Baer Field, Fort Wayne Municipal Airport — 02/17

Indiana
County: Allen
Proposed is the expansion of the airport facilities at Fort Wayne Municipal Airport, Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Allen County, Indiana. This proposal will involve the acquisition of approximately 1930 acres, extending Runway 13-31 and parallel taxiway from 6200 feet to 7200 feet, relocating instrument landing system and approach light system strengthening the entire 900 ft. length of runway 4-22, general improvements to aircraft terminal area, and construction of a new FAA Air Traffic Control Tower and 100 space vehicle parking lot.
(ELR ORDER # 80166)

Cedar Rapids Municipal Airport Runway Construction — 02/15

Iowa
County: Linn
This project involves the acquisition of 1,077 acres of land, construction of a 950 foot extension to the northwest end of Runway 13-31, construction of two new 4,000 foot general aviation runways (8R-26L and 13R-31L), including taxiways and lighting, addition to air carrier terminal and related improvements to the Cedar Rapids Municipal Airport located in Linn County, Iowa. The principal impacts include the removal of approximately 295 acres of prime farmland from production and relocation of 8 families.
(ELR ORDER # 80155)

Menominee County Airport, Runway Construction — 02/07

Michigan
County: Menominee
The County of Menominee has submitted a request for Federal financial assistance under the Airport and Airway Development Program, as authorized by the Airport and Airway development Amendments of 1976, for Menominee County Airport, Menominee, Michigan. Proposed is the acquisition of approximately 490 acres of land; construction of a new NE-SW Runway 150x6500 feet with connecting taxiway system,

high intensity runway lights, and an instrument landing system; enlargement of the terminal and general aviation aprons; closing a section of County Road 577 and 38th Avenue; and the relocation of 35 households, one dairy farm, and one retail shoe business.
(ELR ORDER # 80117)

Federal Highway Administration

Draft — Date

I-65-3(52)(53) and M-7257(1), Lewisburg to Warrior — 02/06

Alabama
County: Jefferson
Project I-65-3(52)(53) is a 14.5 mile, 4, 6 or 8 lane, limited access facility extending from Lewisburg (5-mile creek) to Warrior. Project M-7257(1) is a 0.4 mile, non-limited access, 4-lane facility beginning at the Mt. Olive Road Interchange and extending easterly to US 31 in Gardendale. The beneficial effects are that the project will ease traffic movement in and through their corridors, safety benefits will accrue, economy and growth will be enhanced, and accessibility to public facilities and services will be enhanced.
Region 4 FHWA-ALA-EIS-78-01D
(ELR ORDER # 80113)

Relocation of US 278, Gadsden to Piedmont — 02/28

Alabama
County: Etowah Calhoun
Proposed is the improvement of US 278 from the Eastern Gadsden City Limits to the Western Piedmont City Limits located in Etowah and Calhoun Counties. This new four-lane facility will replace the old two-lane road from the end of the present four-lane in Gadsden and link it to the beginning of the four-lane in Piedmont. The total length of the project is 18.7 miles of non-controlled access.
FHWA-AL-EIS-78-02D
(ELR ORDER # 80197)

Mar Vista Street, Whittier Blvd. to College Ave. — 02/13

California
County: Los Angeles
The proposed Mar Vista Street (FAU 7892) is located in Los Angeles County, California. The proposed project is 1.04 miles in length and is along the Whittier Select Street System alignment and the existing alignment between Whittier Boulevard and College Avenue. The project will include widening the street to 80-110 feet, existing traffic signals will be upgraded, sidewalks and necessary

wheel chair ramps will be constructed, and runoff will be diverted to a new storm drain system scheduled for concurrent construction.
FHWA-CA-EIS-76-01-D
(ELR ORDER # 80144)

Route 91 Freeway and Harbor Freeway Interchange 02/27

California
County: Los Angeles
The proposed project covers 5.3 miles of the Route 91 freeway designated as the "Redondo Beach Freeway" between the Long Beach Freeway, CA-7 and the Harbor Freeway in the Southern portion of Los Angeles County. The project also includes ramp removal and construction work along the Harbor Freeway. The project is divided into two segments: west and east. The uncompleted west segment is 0.5 miles long and extends from the Harbor Freeway to east of Main Street and is proposed to become an eight lane freeway. The completed east segment is 4.8 miles long and extends from Main Street to Long Beach Freeway.
FHWA-CA-EIS-77-05-D
(ELR ORDER # 80188)

Project M 7500 (4), Horizon Drive 02/06

Colorado
County: Mesa
This proposed project includes the study and evaluation of upgrading and/or improving the transportation system in the northwestern part of Grand Junction and Mesa County. Specifically, this study evaluates the existing transportation system in a corridor extending from the area where Horizon Drive currently terminates at Seventh Street westward to US 6 and 50. This corridor is centered on Patterson Road.
FHWA-Colo-EIS-77-05-D
(ELR ORDER # 80112)

Hospital Loop Road, Lake City 02/17

Florida
County: Columbia
The proposed action is located east of the center of Lake City, Columbia County, Florida. The project consists of providing a connecting street between north First Street in the vicinity of Franklin Street to east Duval Street in the vicinity of DeSoto Drive or the Old Jacksonville Highway. The proposed Hospital Loop Road would be a municipal type section approximately 1/2 to 1 mile in length, depending upon the alternative selected, with 2 travel lanes, refuge lanes, curbs, gutters, grass strip, sidewalks and street lights. The proposed facility would follow an alignment that combines several narrow existing streets. (FHWA-FLA-EIS-77-6-D).
(ELR ORDER # 80161)

Keaau-Pahoa Road, Pahoa Bypass, Project RS-0130(17 02/06

Hawaii
The proposed project is located in the Puna District in the vicinity of Pahoa Village on the Island of Hawaii. The existing roadway under consideration is a portion of the Keaau-Pahoa-Kalapana Road (route FAS 130), starting from the vicinity of Kahakai Boulevard, 2.8 miles, to south of the Pahoa-Kapoho-Kalapana junction. Two concepts are considered: (1) an improvement through Pahoa town and (2) a bypass of the town. A route through town would continue to route all traffic through town along a limited right-of-way.
FHWA-HI-EIS-78-01-D
(ELR ORDER # 80110)

US 51, 5th Avenue to Lakeview Drive, Rochelle 02/27

Illinois
County: Ogle
The proposed FHWA action is the financing with Federal-aid matching funds of all or part of the costs of constructing a railroad-highway separation and necessary approaches of US 51 in the city of Rochelle. The project begins near the intersection of Fifth Avenue and Seventh Street, and proceeds in a southerly direction terminating near Lakeview Drive. This project is about 0.5 mile in length and is located in Ogle County. The new facility is planned as a two-lane bridge structure, and includes the construction or reconstruction of several intersection and adjacent side streets. FA Route 412, a supplemental freeway currently under construction, is mentioned in this statement.
(ELR ORDER # 80194)

Fort Wayne Bypass, Project No. F-170-2(1) 02/07

Indiana
County: Allen
This project proposes the development of a circumurban route at Fort Wayne, Allen County, Indiana. The partially access-controlled highway is planned to include two 2-lane pavements separated by a median 60 feet wide within a right-of-way typically 290 feet wide. The study lines range in length from approximately 12.7 to 15.0 miles. The project limits are US 30 near New Haven on the south and I-69 north of Fort Wayne. The total improvement would supplement I-69 to yield a complete circumurban route.
FHWA-IND-EIS-77-07-D
(ELR ORDER # 80120)

Iowa 14, Project No. F-14-5 02/09

Iowa
County: Marshall
The proposed study provides for four-lane construction

of a 0.9 mile section of existing Iowa 14 in Marshalltown, from just south of East Anson Street at South Center Street northerly and easterly to East Church street at South Third Avenue (additional right-of-way would be necessary for any of the construction alternatives). The proposed Iowa 14 improvement is in full cooperation with Iowa DOT's Transportation Plan, and the 1995 Transportation Plan for Marshalltown. The need for the proposed improvement is to eliminate a capacity restriction on the existing highway for operation and safety. FHWA-IOWA-EIS-77-06-D
(ELR ORDER # 80135)

Northeast Inner Loop, Sioux City Bypass 02/22

Iowa
County: Woodbury
The Northeast Inner Loop is a 2.5 mile, 4-lane urban arterial roadway which bypasses downtown Sioux City to the north and east, in Woodbury County, Iowa. The project proceeds from the intersection of 14th Street and Hamilton Boulevard easterly to Floyd Boulevard, then southerly to I-29.
FHWA-IA-EIS-77-04-D.
(ELR ORDER # 80176)

US 50 Study Improvements, Vienna 02/27

Maryland
County: Dorchester
The proposed project involves a study of the location and type of highway improvements required to provide improved traffic service to local communities by reducing accident rates, relieving local congestion, and correcting the impeded traffic flow resulting from seasonal traffic in the Cambridge, Vienna, and Salisbury areas of Maryland's Eastern Shore. Traffic impediments are caused by restricted road and bridge widths, merging lanes, signal operations, frequent curb cuts and local traffic. The Vienna study limits will be from the dual section of US 50 northwest of Vienna to the dual section southeast of Vienna, a distance of about 4.5 miles of two-lane roadway.
(ELR ORDER # 80190)

Corridor Alignment, Improvements of MI-37/MI-82 Bridge 02/08

Michigan
County: Newaygo
This project was initiated to correct the deficiencies of M-37/M-82 bridge over the C & O Railway and Penoyer Creek in the City of Newaygo, Newaygo County, Michigan. The maximum length of this project is one mile. It extends northward from the Muskegon River to approximately 1,700

feet north of the Newaygo city limit. Presently, M-37/ M-82 is a two-lane area service highway. Improvements being considered in this Statement range from minor bridge repairs to relocating and widening M-37 to four lanes.
FHWA-MICH-EIS-77-05-D
(ELR ORDER # 80129)

Permit, US 321, Middle Fork Creek 02/03

North Carolina
County: Watauga
Proposed is the improvement of the existing two lane US 321 highway by widening to a basic four lane highway. The improvement is 5.3 miles in length between Boone and Blowing Rock in Watauga County, North Carolina. Widening of the highway will require channel changes of Middle Fork Creek, a tributary of the South Fork of the New River. The channel involves 3,550 feet of the stream. Wijening of US 321 will require reconstruction of 500 feet of the Blue Ridge Parkway and a new bridge 200 feet in length which carries Parkway traffic over US 321.
(ELR ORDER # 80107)

US 221, Marion Bypass 02/10

North Carolina
County: McDowell
The proposed action is the construction of a highway facility that will provide a bypass for traffic presently routed through the Town of Marion, North Carolina. Approval may be required from Federal Aviation Administration since the project is located within two miles of a privately owned public-use airport. The proposed action will result in beneficial impacts in terms of safer and more efficient traffic operation in the US 221 corridor especially in the central business district of Marion.

FHWA-NC-EIS-78-01-D
(ELR ORDER # 80138)

State Route 1201 at Salter Path 02/14

North Carolina
County: Carteret
The proposed action is the improvement of an approximate one mile section of SR1201 in the area of the community of Salter Path and the Town of Indian Beach, Carteret County, North Carolina. SR 1201, east and west of Salter Path, has received approval for the construction of a two-lane road with shoulders. This action will serve as the connecting link between the improved sections of SR 1201. The new curbs and gutter roadway will be contained within a 60 foot wide right-of-way. The remainder of the project length will be a segment of two-lane roadway (24 feet of

pavement) with shoulders along the existing road which will tie into the two-lane road west of Salter Path.
(ELR ORDER # 80150)

3rd Street, Southeast Mandan, Improvement 02/13

North Dakota
County: Morton
The proposed project is located in Southeast Mandan, Morton County, North Dakota. The purpose of the proposed improvement is to construct a street from ND Highway 1806 easterly to Memorial Highway. The length of the project varies from 6,000 to 6,600 feet depending upon which alternative is selected. The project consists of the purchase of right-of-way and the construction of a street between the two aforementioned highways.
FHWA-ND-EIS-78-01D
(ELR ORDER # 80139)

Basin Ave. and Going Str. Interchange, Greeley Ave 02/27

Oregon
County: Multnomah
The purpose of the proposed action is to improve access to the Swan Island industrial area and relieve future traffic related problems on North Going Street located in Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon. The alternatives consist of roadway improvements, and construction of ingress and egress ramps to connect Greeley Avenue with I-5 in the vicinity of the Freemont Bridge interchange. This action would provide for the diversion of traffic, to and from I-5 south, from North Going Street to Greeley Avenue.
FHWA-OR-EIS-78-1-D
(ELR ORDER # 80187)

Final Date

Brookwood Sta. Area Improvements, I-85, I-75 02/07

Georgia
County: Fulton DeKalb
Proposed are improvements of Brookwood Interchange (I-75, I-85 Interchange), I-75 extending 0.5 miles NW and I-85 extending 3.1 miles NE of the Brookwood Interchange. Project goals include the reduction of existing congestion at the Brookwood Interchange and improvement of the Facility's capacity such that it can accomodate anticipated traffic volume increases. The proposed action also includes the addition of driving lanes to I-85 and provision of an arterial connector facility connecting Pershing Point and Buford Highway. Displacement of 8 families and 26 businesses will occur.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA HUD DOI EPA HEW COE DOC UMTA
State and Local agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80118)

I-85, Fulton-DeKalb Co. to I-285 02/07

Georgia
County: DeKalb
Proposed are improvements to I-85 and associated frontage and crossover roads in DeKalb County, Georgia. The project would begin at the DeKalb County line near Druid Hills Road and extend northeast for 5.7 miles to an intersection with I-285. The limited access highway would have 6 or 8 lanes plus frontage road improvements. Negative effects include acquisition of a small amount of right-of-way, displacement of 4 businesses, and an increase in noise which would exceed design noise levels at one church and commercial site. (Region 4)
COMMENTS MADE BY: FEA HUD DOC USDA FPC EPA DOI HEW COE
State, Regional and Local Agencies
(ELR ORDER # 80119)

US 54 Improvement, Wichita 02/13

Kansas
County: Sedgwick
Proposed is the improvement of 0.7 mile of U.S. 54 highway to six lane freeway standards, from Topeka Avenue east to Lulu Avenue, all in the City of Wichita, Kansas. The improvement will consist of right-of-way acquisition with full control of access, grading, surfacing, bridges, fencing, lighting, signalization, and all other work necessary to complete the facility. Adverse effects include the displacement of 34 homes, five apartment houses, and 15 businesses. (Region 7)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA EDA HUD FEA HEW EPA DOI DOT OEO CQE
State and Local Agencies
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80145)

MA-25 and MA-28, Wareham, Plymouth, and Bourne 02/07

Massachusetts
County: Barnstable Plymouth
The proposed project will extend Route 25 from its present terminus in Wareham to the Bourne bridge crossing of the Cape Cod Canal. When completed the highway will carry through traffic to Cape Cod thereby eliminating the severe traffic congestion which presently occurs on combined Routes 6 and 28. The proposed route passes through the towns of Wareham and Plymouth in Plymouth County and the town of Bourne in Barnstable County. The FHWA has combined two draft EISs into one final EIS.
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP USDA COE DOC DOD HEW
HUD DOI EPA
state and local agencies
concerned groups and individuals
(ELR ORDER #80126)

I-215 Southeast Belt Route, Salt Lake City 02/16

Utah
County: Salt Lake
The statement proposes the construction of 6.5 miles of controlled access, six-lane freeway to complete I-215, the beltway around Salt Lake City. Adverse impacts would be the displacement of 12 to 36 residences and 0 to 20 businesses, substantial noise impact to some adjacent locations, long-term visual impact, removal of existing vegetation within the project corridor and resulting decreased water quality due to added roadway runoff, and temporary construction disruption.
FHWA-UT-EIS-75-03-F
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI USDA EPA HUD LAB
Groups and Individuals
(ELR ORDER # 80159)

Supplement Date

K-7 at Bonner Springs (S-3) 02/27

Kansas
County: Wyandotte
This Supplement has been prepared to assess the environmental effects of an alternative location that was previously dropped from consideration. Proposed is the improvement of approximately 2 miles of KS-7 highway in Bonner Springs, Kansas, from Nettleton Avenue north to the existing improved portion of KS-7 north of the Kansas turnpike entrance. The proposed project includes grading, surfacing, bridge construction, and right-of-way acquisition.
FHWA-KANS-EIS-72-07-FS(3rd)
(ELR ORDER # 80193)

I-77 and US 74 Connector, Charlotte 02/07
North Carolina
The purpose of this supplemental statement is to present an evaluation of a more southerly route and compare it to the most feasible of the alternatives presented in the DEIS which was filed with CEQ March 21, 1977. The Division of Highways proposes to construct a multi-lane freeway connecting I-77 and US 74 south of Charlotte in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. The proposed action will be the initial section (13.3-16.6 miles in length) of the outer circumferential route around Charlotte included in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Comprehensive Plan.
(ELR ORDER # 80123)

I-90 to Bemus Point, 4(f) Lake Chautagua 02/21

Pennsylvania New York
This supplement to the final EIS on the Southern Tier Expressway contains significant information in support of the recommended alternative for the Chautauqua Lake 4(f) Statement and the Southern Tier Expressway between Bemus Point, New York and Erie, Pennsylvania.
FHWA-NY-EIS-76-04-F
(ELR ORDER # 80173)

SR 5, South 272nd Street 02/03

Washington
County: King
The proposed project is a diamond interchange, park and ride lot, and flyer stop which is to be constructed on Interstate 5, south 272nd Street approximately ten miles south of the Seattle corporate limits in King County, Washington. This environmental impact statement for alternative design of the interchange was approved in 1973. The park and ride lot, designated as Site A contains 500 stalls and a ramp level flyer stop. This report has been prepared to outline the impacts associated with the interchange and the inclusion of the park and ride lot and flyer stop.
(ELR ORDER # 80104)

U.S.Coast Guard

Draft Date

Tanker Safety and Pollution Prevention 02/03

This impact statement covers US participation in the international conference on Tanker Safety and Pollution Prevention, February 1978, in London, England, and possible US implementation of the standards adopted by this conference. The objective is to obtain international action to improve Tanker Safety and Pollution Prevention Standards. The changes are being sought to reduce oil pollution from tanker accidents and routine operational discharges, and to reduce the risk of tanker accidents and resulting loss of life and property damage.
(ELR ORDER # 80099)

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Contact: (For Housing Programs)
Mr. Lyman T. Miller
Assistant Director for Construction and Valuation
Veterans Administration
810 Vermont Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2691
(Medicine and Surgery)
Mr. Jon E. Baer
Chief, Environmental Planning Division
Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C.
(202) 389-3316

| Draft | Date |
|---|---|
| Bay Pines, VA Center, Improvements | 02/24 |

Florida
County: Pinellas

This project proposes construction on the existing site of a 520-Bed Medical and surgical replacement Building with support facilities for the Veterans Administration Center at Bay Pines, Florida. A new 120-Bed Nursing Home Care Unit to supplement the existing Nursing Home and a 200-Bed Domiciliary are also proposed. Building 1, presently serving as a hopital patient building, and Building 23, functioning as a clinic, will both be renovated for administration and ancillary services not included in the proposed New Medical and Surgical Building.
(ELR ORDER # 80185)

Summary of 102 Statements Filed Through

2/28/78 (By Agency)

| Agency | Draft 102's for actions on which no final 102's have been received | Final 102's on legislation and actions | Supplements | Total actions on which draft or final statements have been received |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agriculture, Department of | 197 | 882 | 17 | 1096 |
| Appalachian Regional Commission | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Architect of the Capitol | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 42 | 144 | 0 | 186 |
| Canal Zone Government | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Commerce, Department of | 32 | 85 | 23 | 140 |
| Consumer Product Safety Commission | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Defense, Department of | 11 | 9 | 1 | 21 |
| Air Force | 9 | 31 | 2 | 42 |
| Army | 0 | 33 | 3 | 36 |
| Army Corps of Engineers | 572 | 1183 | 51 | 1806 |
| Navy | 11 | 48 | 5 | 64 |
| Delaware River Basin Commission | 3 | 8 | 0 | 11 |
| Energy, Department of | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Energy Policy Office | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Energy Research & Development Admin. | 4 | 18 | 0 | 22 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | 66 | 130 | 7 | 203 |
| Federal Energy Administration | 11 | 14 | 6 | 31 |
| Federal Maritime Commission | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Federal Power Commission | 81 | 71 | 6 | 158 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| General Services Administration | 22 | 111 | 4 | 137 |
| HEW, Department of | 3 | 19 | 0 | 22 |
| HUD, Department of | 102 | 359 | 6 | 467 |
| Interior, Department of | 145 | 427 | 9 | 581 |
| International Boundary and Water Commission -- U.S. & Mexico | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 13 | 17 | 0 | 30 |
| Justice, Department of | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| Labor, Department of | 6 | 8 | 0 | 14 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Adm. | 10 | 27 | 4 | 41 |
| National Capitol Planning Comm. | 5 | 9 | 0 | 14 |
| National Science Foundation | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| New England River Basins Comm. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | 9 | 50 | 14 | 73 |
| Office of Science and Technology | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Ohio River Basin Commission | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Pacific Northwest River Basins Comm. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Pennsylvania Ave. Devel. Corp. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins Comm. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| State Department | 4 | 7 | 0 | 11 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 7 | 32 | 0 | 39 |
| Transportation, Department of | 1000 | 2445 | 48 | 3493 |
| Treasury, Department of | 4 | 7 | 0 | 11 |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin Comm. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| U.S. Postal Service | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 |
| U.S. Water Resources Council | 7 | 9 | 0 | 16 |
| Veterans Administration | 7 | 10 | 0 | 17 |
| TOTALS | 2402 | 6228 | 207 | 8837 |

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF THE
ADMINISTRATOR

## 102 Monitor

The 102 Monitor is a monthly publication of the Environmental Protection Agency. In addition to its listing of Environmental Impact Statements which have been filed under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Monitor contains a list of EPA's comments, filed under the provisions of section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended; items of current concern in NEPA case law; information on the environmental studies of the Council on Environmental Quality; and other matters of interest.

The 102 Monitor is printed and distributed by the Government Printing Office. The subscription rate for the Monitor is $21.50 annually, with an additional $5.40 charge for foreign mailing; individual copies of the Monitor are $1.80 from GPO.

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

(Difficulties in obtaining copies of the 102 Monitor should be referred to GPO's Service Section, P.O. Box SSOS, Washington, D.C. 20402.)

CHANGE OF ADDRESS FORM

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

(or) COUNTRY

Mail this form to: NEW ADDRESS

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office SSOM
Washington, D.C. 20402

Attach last subscription label here.

---

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION TO: 102 MONITOR (MNT)

@ $21.50 Domestic; @ $26.90 Foreign.

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

(or) COUNTRY

☐ Remittance Enclosed (Make checks payable to Superintendent of Documents)

☐ Charge to my Deposit Account No. .....

MAIL ORDER FORM TO:
Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402